

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH

WILLIAM KURRELMMEYER

JAMES EUSTACE SHAW

CONTENTS

BRIGGS, W. D.—Source-Material for Jonson's Plays. Part II,	- - 321
LIVINGSTON, ARTHUR.—Venice 1727: Sonnets on the Execution of Domenico Althan,	- - - - - 334
SEHRT, EDWARD H.—Grimmelshausen as a Dialectologer,	- - - 338
BARNUM, GEORGE S.—Saint-Pierre and Balzac,	- - - - - 343

Reviews:—

HUGH WALKER, The English Essay and Essayists. [F. W. Bryan.]	- 347
O. P. REIN, Mixed Preterites in German. [H. C. G. von Jagemann.]	- 356
D. CHEYDLEUR, Essai sur l'évolution des doctrines de M. Georges Sorel. [A. O. Lovejoy.]	- - - - - 360
ALBERT SCHINZ and HELEN M. KING, Seventeenth Century French Read- ings. [G. N. Henning.]	- - - - - 363

Correspondence:—

WHITE, FLORENCE D.—A Sentence from an English Notebook of Voltaire's,	369
FULTON, EDWARD.—Spenser, Sidney, and the Areopagus,	- - - 372
MONBOE, B. S.—Notes on the Anglo-Saxon <i>Andreas</i> ,	- - - 374
GILLET, J. E.—The Authorship of <i>Gorboduc</i> ,	- - - 377
COFFMAN, GEORGE R.—Collins and Thomson—A Suggestion,	- - - 378

Brief Mention:—

TUCKER BROOKE, <i>Common Conditions</i> ;—ADOLFO PADOVAN, <i>Vita di Benvenuto Cellini</i> ;—Goedekes <i>Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung</i> ;—SIR SIDNEY LEE, <i>A Life of William Shakespeare</i> ;—BLISS PERRY, <i>Thomas Carlyle: How to know him</i> ;—L. RAYMOND TALBOT, <i>French Composition</i> ,	- - - - - 370
--	---------------

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Thirty-Five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION (with intermission from July to October inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures.

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$2.00 for the United States and Mexico; \$2.25 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to Murray P. Brush; and for the Italian and Spanish Departments to J. E. Shaw. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays, and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.



OXFORD GERMAN SERIES

By AMERICAN SCHOLARS

General Editor: JULIUS GOEBEL, Ph. D.



New and Recent Volumes

Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen. By Grillparzer. Edited, with Notes and a Study of Grillparzer's life and works, by John L. Kind. Inhaltsangaben, Fragen, Rückblicke und Themen by C. M. Purin and John L. Kind. *Crown 8vo, pp. cxxxv + 208. With 4 Illustrations.*.....70c.

"Such an edition is a genuine contribution to the collection of texts that every German teacher must prize."—Prof. ALICE P. STEVENS, Mt. Holyoke College.

A Scientific German Reader. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by Herbert Z. Kip. *Crown 8vo, pp. xii + 445. 31 Figures.*...\$1.25

This Reader is designed not merely to furnish a certain amount of reading material along scientific lines but rather to give selections which may afford glimpses into unexplored fields. The translation of scientific works requires careful study and great accuracy. With this in mind Professor Kip has prepared notes that are more than ordinarily rich in information and in helpful discussion.

Schuld and Other Stories. By Ilse Leskien. Edited, with Notes, Vocabulary, Exercises, and an Appendix containing Helps to Translation, by Bayard Quincy Morgan. *Crown 8vo, pp. iv + 154.*.....40c.

"The stories are delightfully refreshing and should be appreciated by learners and teacher. The carefully prepared appendix should interest the student of translation."—Prof. Catherine M. Cox, College of the Pacific.

Others in preparation.

Send for complete catalogue.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH
35 West 32nd Street, New York

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXI

JUNE, 1916

NUMBER 6

SOURCE-MATERIAL FOR JONSON'S PLAYS

PART II

Every Man in His Humour

Dedication.

"I am none of those, that can suffer the benefits confer'd vpon my youth, to perish with my age. It is a fraile memorie, that remembers but present things." Seneca, *De Ben.*, I, xii, 2: Apud paucos post rem manet gratia, plures sunt, apud quos non diutius in animo sunt donata quam in usu. III, xvii, 3: gratum hominem semper beneficium delectat, ingratum semel. Cf. the dedication of *Poetaster*: "A thankefull man owes a courtesie euer: the vn-thankefull, but when he needes it."

Prologue.

Though need make many poets, etc.

So Persius, *Saturae*, Prol. 9:

Magister artis ingenique largitor
Venter.

III, ii:

Master Stephen has bought from Brainworm a rapier under the impression that it was a Toledo; but it is not a Toledo.

Bray. No sir, I confesse it, it is none.

Step. Doe you confesse it? gentlemen, beare witnesse, he has confest it. By gods will, and you had not confest it—

The jest is not original with Jonson. Was it original with Sir Thomas More? See *Mori Lucubrationes*, 1563, 225:

RIDICULUM, IN MINACEM

Thrasonis uxorem bubulcus rusticus
 Absente eo uitiauerat.
 Domum reuersus miles ut rem comperit,
 Armatus & ferus insilit.
 Tandem assecutus solum in agris rusticum,
 Heus clamat heus heus furcifer.
 Restat bubulcus, saxaque in sinum legit.
 Ille ense stricto clamat,
 Tu coniugem meam attigisti carnifex?
 Respondit imperterritus,
 Feci. fateris, inquit? At ego omnes Deos
 Deasque testor o scelus,
 In pectus hunc ensem tibi capulo tenus,
 Ni fassus esses, abderem.

III, iii.

No greater hell, then to be slaue to feare.

Seneca is constantly emphasizing the fact that fear of what may happen is the greatest of evils. See *Ep.* xcvi, 7: *Nihil est nec miserius nec stultius quam praetimere.*

Every Man out of His Humour

Dedication.

"Yet, I command, it lye not in the way of your more noble, and vse-full studies to the publike. For so I shall suffer for it: But, when the gowne and cap is off, and the Lord of liberty raignes; then, to take it in your hands, perhaps may make some Bencher, tinted with humanity, reade: and not repent him."

So Martial, x, xix, 12 ff.:

Sed ne tempore non tuo disertam
 Pulses ebria ianuam, videto:
 Totas dat tetricae dies Minervae,
 Seras tutior ibis ad lucernas:
 Haec hora est tua, cum furit Lyaeus,
 Cum regnat rosa, cum madent capilli:
 Tunc me vel rigidi legant Catones.

The character of Macilente.

Macilente is the embodiment of envy, not hatred, and accordingly Jonson, in the Induction between I and II, carefully distinguishes between the two emotions. It seems probable that he has here in mind Plutarch's essay, *Of Envy and Hatred* (Transl. 1870, II. 95 ff.), in which an attempt is made to analyze both feelings. "Envy and Hatred are passions so like each other that they are

often taken for the same He who is in prosperity is equally an occasion of grief to the envious and to the malicious man; therefore we look upon benevolence, which is a willing our neighbor's good, as an opposite to both envy and hatred, and fancy these two to be the same because they have a contrary purpose to that of love Hatred proceeds from an opinion that the person we hate is evil, if not generally so, at least in particular to us But envy has only one sort of object, the felicity of others. Whence it becomes infinite, and, like an evil or diseased eye, is offended with every thing that is bright. On the other hand, hatred is always determined by the subject it adheres to . . . But hatred is often just; for there are some men so much to be avoided and disliked, that we should judge those worthy to be hated themselves who do not shun and detest them Again, extreme badness makes hatred more vehement and bitter."

It will be observed that Macilente's envious disposition shows itself more and more as courtesies are done him. Fastidious Brisk carries him to Court, whereupon Macilente betrays to Deliro the fact that Brisk has no standing there. Deliro receives Macilente into his house and furnishes him with fine raiment. Thereupon Macilente seizes the opportunity to kindle discord between husband and wife, and eventually to destroy Deliro's conceit of his own happiness. This behavior is agreeable to what Plutarch says, *ibid.*, 99: "Yet the first of these removes not envy, for men will persist in this vice, though they know they are not wronged; and the two latter (the esteem or credit of a person, and the bestowing a favor) do exasperate it more . . . and when they receive a kindness from any in prosperity, it is with reluctance, as though they grudged them not only the power but the will of conferring it." Compare, for instance, what Macilente says (II, iv) when Deliro welcomes him to his house 'to sojourne euen for euer':

I thanke you, sir:

And yet the muffled fates (had it pleas'd them)
Might haue suppli'd me, from their owne full store,
Without this word (I thanke you) to a foole.
I see no reason, why that dog (call'd Chaunce)
Should fawne vpon this fellow, more then me:
I am a man, and I haue limmes, flesh, bloud,
Bones, sinewes, and a soule, as well as he:
My parts are euery way as good as his,
If I said better? why, I did not lie.

At the end of the play, in the first folio version, Macilente, having succeeded in his various plots, says:

Now is my soule at peace.
I am as emptie of all enuie now,
As they of merit to be enuied at.
My humor (like a flame) no longer lasts
Then it hath stufte to feed it, and their folly,
Being now rak't vp in their repentant ashes,
Affords no ampler subiect to my spleene.
I am so farre from malicing their states,
That I begin to pittie 'hem. It grieues me
To thinke they haue a being. I could wish
They might turne wise vpon it, and be sau'd now,
So heauen were pleas'd."

This is almost a paraphrase of what Plutarch says, *ibid.*, 98: "So, on the other side, misfortunes cause envy to cease, but take not enmity away; for men will be malicious even toward abject enemies, but none envy the distressed. However, what was said by one of our Sophists, that the envious are tenderly inclinable to pity, is true; and in this appears a great unlikeness of these passions, that hatred leaves neither the happy nor the miserable, but envy becomes languid when its object has either prosperity or adversity in excess."

It will be observed that in the second version of the play, presented at Court, Macilente is cured of his envy, not as just described, but by the sight of the Queen.

Neuer till now did obieet greet mine eyes
With any light content: but in her graces,
All my malicious powers haue lost their stings.
Enuie is fled my soule, at sight of her,
And she hath chac'd all black thoughts from my bosome,
Like as the sunne doth darknesse from the world.

The thought here is not exactly the same as in the following quotation from Plutarch, p. 98, but it is very similar and the simile in the last line makes Jonson's source for the idea quite certain: "Yet envy often gives place to the splendor of a matchless prosperity. For it is not likely that any envied Alexander or Cyrus, when they arrived at the height of their conquests and became lords of all. But as the sun, where he passes highest and sends down his beams most directly, has none or very little shadow, so they who are exalted to the meridian of fortune, shining aloof over the

head of envy, have scarce any thing of their brightness eclipsed, while envy retires, being driven away by the brightness overspreading it."

While we are on the subject of envy, it may be worth remarking that this emotion has in the last few generations ceased to occupy the important literary position that it formerly held. If we may judge by the frequency with which it is spoken of and the amount of space that is devoted to an analysis and a description of it and its various forms in the older literatures, whether of the Elizabethan or the classical period, whether in the literature of England or in that of the continent, envy was considered to be one of the major passions of mankind, quite comparable in importance and interest with hate or love or ambition. Curiously enough, modern writers do not have a great deal to say about it. As a spring of human action, it has been degraded to a very low position. To some extent this degradation is due to our modern desire to cast off the shackles of literary tradition. Yet I suspect that there is more in the phenomenon than this. There has been a real change in human nature. That human nature does change can hardly be denied by anyone who considers the question and tries candidly to think it through. For better or worse, we simply are not what our ancestors were. In respect to envy, there is no doubt that it does not play the part in our lives that it formerly did, and one cause of the difference (the causes are probably numerous and complex) may be readily pointed out. Social life used to be organized on a monarchical basis. Not only was there the court of the king, but each nobleman had his own in miniature. The usual way of attaining social importance was to attach yourself to one of the larger or smaller circles centering about those whose importance was hereditary. In that circle you rose perhaps by the caprice of your patron, perhaps by your own merit, perhaps by your skill in depressing others, perhaps by flattery, perhaps by fortune. The opportunities were few, the aspirants many. "It is in kings' courts," says Lucian (Fowler's translation, iv, 5), "that these creatures are mostly found; they thrive in the atmosphere of dominion and power, where envy is rife, suspicions innumerable, and the opportunities for flattery and back-biting endless. Where hopes are higher, there envy is more intense, hatred more reckless, and jealousy more unscrupulous. They all keep close watch upon one

another, spying like duellists for a weak spot. Every one would be first, and to that end shoves and elbows his neighbour aside, and does his best to pull back or trip the man in front of him. One whose equipment is limited to goodness is very soon thrown down, dragged about, and finally thrust forth with ignominy; while he who is prepared to flatter, and can make servility plausible, is high in credit, gets first to his end, and triumphs."

The complexity of modern civilization and the corresponding complexity of modern human nature (I am not using these words without a full sense of responsibility) as conditions bearing not alone upon characterization in fiction, but also upon the choice of motives on the part of the writer and upon the relative importance which these various motives possess, afford a problem of the highest interest, and one not yet touched by systematic investigation. Tragedy is interested therein as well as comedy.

Speech to Queen Elizabeth at end of play:

O heauen, that shee (whose presence hath effected
This change in me) may suffer most late change
In her admir'd and happie gouernement.

This use of 'late' is distinctly a Latinism; the word is employed precisely as 'serus' is in a passage like the following from Seneca, *Ad Pol. de Consol.*, XII, 5: sera et nepotibus demum nostris dies nota sit, qua illum gens sua coelo adserat. So in Horace, *Carm.*, I, ii, 45: serus in caelum redeas. One can only be puzzled by the strange use to which this passage has been put by van Dam and Stoffel (*Anglia*, xxvi, 386-7) in their argument that Jonson was not responsible for the second ending in the Folio version of the play. Aside from the facts that such Latinisms were more or less characteristic of Jonson's style and that the lines are evidently a reminiscence of such Latin expressions as those quoted above, the passage is perfectly clear in itself. Macilente is not hoping that "a change might come over the Queen's admired and happy government," but is hoping that the change (when it takes place, as he knows it must) will occur as late as possible. He is praying for Elizabeth's long life. The meaning that van Dam and Stoffel attach to his words is, as they very properly point out, "absurd to a degree." But it is their meaning, not the author's.

New Inn

To the Reader.

What did they come for, then? thou wilt ask me. I will as punctually answer: To see, and to be seen.

Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, I, 99:

Spectatum veniunt; veniunt, spectentur et ipsae.

Poetaster

V, iii, 149-51.

Caes. We know it, our deare Virgil, and esteeme it
A most dishonest practice, in that man,
Will seeme too wittie in anothers worke.

Martial, preface to Lib. I: Absit a iocorum nostrorum simplicitate malignus interpres nec epigrammata mea scribat: improbe facit qui in alieno libro ingeniosus est. This passage Jonson had also in mind in his letter to Salisbury, 1605.

Last line of song at end of play.

And apes are apes, though cloth'd in scarlet.

Erasmus, *Praise of Folly*, transl. repr. 1900, p. 29: "A trite proverb, That an ape will be an ape, though clad in purple"; in *Adagia*, ed. 1649, pp. 151, 192, 491, he gives various Latin and Greek instances of the use of the proverb.

Apol. Dial. 129-32.

and those so sparingly,
As all the rest might haue sate still, vnquestion'd,
Had they but had the wit, or conscience,
To thinke well of themselues.

Martial, as above: Spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum, ut de illis queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit.

Apol. Dial. 213-5.

Where, if I proue the pleasure but of one,
So he iudicious be; He shall b'alone
A Theatre vnto me.

It may very well be that, as Gifford says, Jonson has a passage of Cicero in mind, but it is interesting to observe that another classical author, whom Jonson apparently knew as well as he did Cicero, has developed this idea at much greater length. Lucian's

Harmonides is built up entirely on this thought, except that he uses the simile of a jury rather than that of a theatre of spectators.

Some borrowings from Seneca in this dialogue are noted in the article on *Cynthia's Revels* referred to below.

Sejanus

Chapman's *In Sejanum*, 97 ff.

Performing such a liuely Euidence
in thy Narrations, that thy Hearers still
Thou turnest to thy Spectators; and the sense
That thy Spectators haue of good or ill,
Thou inject'st joyntly to thy Readers soules.

Plutarch, *Whether the Athenians were more Warlike or Learned* (Translation, 1870, v, 402): "Therefore Thucydides always drives at this perspicuity, to make the hearer (as it were) a spectator, and to inculcate the same passions and perturbations of mind into his readers as they were in who beheld the causes of those effects." My note on the meaning of Chapman's lines must be accordingly modified.

Chapman, 123 ff.

so odorous Flowers
being held too neere the Sensor of our Sense,
Render not pure, nor so sincere their powers,
As being held a little distance thence;
Because much troubled Earthy parts improve them:
Which mixed with the odors we exhall,
Do vitiate what we drawe in. But remoove them
A little space, the Earthy parts do fall,
And what is pure, and hote by his tenuitye,
is to our powers of Savor purely borne.

Chapman would seem to be thinking of Plutarch, *Symposiacs*, Transl. 1870, III, 223: "Thus a rose smells most fragrant at a distance; but if you bring it near the nose, it is not so pure and delightful; and the reason is this,—many earthy disturbing particles are carried with the smell, and spoil the fragrantcy when near, but in a longer passage those are lost, and the pure brisk odor, by reason of its subtilty, reaches and acts upon the sense."

Strachey's *Upon Sejanus*.

If men will shun swolne Fortunes ruinous blastes,
Let them use Temperance. Nothing violent lastes.

Seneca, *Troades*, 258 ff.

violenta nemo imperia continuit diu,
moderata durant; quoque Fortuna altius
evexit ac levavit humanas opes,
hoc se magis suppressere felicem decet
variosque casus tremere metuentem deos
nimium faventes.

I, i, 90.

God-like Cato. The phrase, as noted in my edition, is no doubt from Horace, but it is still interesting to compare Jonson's note on his use of the epithet 'god-like' in *Part of the King's Entertainment*: "An attribute giuen to great persons, fitly about other, humanity, and in frequent vse with all the greeke Poets, especially Homer Iliad a—*δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς*. And in the same booke.—*καὶ ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον*."

I, ii, 177-8.

Of all wilde beasts, preserue me from a tyranne;
And of all tame, a flatterer.

Plutarch, *Banquet of the Seven Wise Men*, Transl. 1870, II, 5: "Another time, in a dispute that happened in your company about the nature of beasts, you [Thales] affirmed that of wild beasts, a king, of tame, a flatterer was the worst." But in *How to Know a Flatterer from a Friend*, II, 128, this saying is attributed by Plutarch to Bias.

III, i, 87.

And may they know no riuals, but themselues.

In addition to my note on the line, cf. Seneca, *Herc. Fur.*, 83-4:

quæris Alcidae parem?
nemo est nisi ipse: bella iam secum gerat.

III, i, 267-9.

O Ioue, let it become me
To boast my deedes, when he, whom they concerne,
Shall thus forget them.

Plutarch, *How a Man may praise Himself without being envied*, Transl. 1870, II, 309: "But self-praise is not liable to disgrace or blame when it is delicately handled by way of apology to remove a calumny or accusation. Thus Pericles: But ye are angry at me, a man inferior to none, whether it be in the understanding or

interpreting of necessary things; a man who am a lover of my country, and above the meannesses of bribes. For, in speaking with this gallantry of himself, he was not only free from arrogance, vanity, and ambition, but he demonstrated the greatness and spirit of that virtue which could not be dejected itself, and even humbled and tamed the haughtiness of envy." It is perhaps questionable whether Silius handled his self-praise very delicately, but as Afer later remarks this was a common custom of his blood.

III, i, 326 ff.

All that can happen in humanitie . . .
 . . . I am fortified against;
 And can looke downe vpon: they are beneath me.

Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.*, v, 1: Virtus . . . omnia, quae cadere in hominem possunt, subter se habet: eaque despiciens, casus contemnit humanos.

III, iii, 38.

Who nourisheth a lyon, must obey him.

For the sentiment, see Aristophanes, *Frogs*, where the idea is applied to Alcibiades by Aeschylus: "One must not rear a lion's whelp within the city: above all not rear a lion in the city; but if one rear it, one must submit to its ways" (Arist. Bohn Lib., II, 609). The translator refers also to passages in Euripides, *Troades*, 718; *Heracleidae*, 1005; Cornford, *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, 193, compares 'the famous simile in the third chorus of the *Agamemnon*.'

Barnaby Rich, *Faultes*, 1606, 41 verso, says that Aristophanes "devised a tragedie, raysing Pericles from hell," in which he uttered this sentiment concerning the lion. It would seem that the good Barnaby did not get his information at first hand.

IV, iii, 73-4:

A good man should, and must
 Sit rather downe with losse, then rise vniust.

To my note on this passage add that 'to do is worse than to suffer evil' is one of the "two famous paradoxes of Socrates" (Jowett, 3rd ed., II, 270), cf. *Gorgias*, *ibid.*, 356 ff., and see Plutarch, *How a Young Man ought to hear Poems*, Transl. 1870, II, 92. Aristotle takes the same position, *Ethics*, v, 15.

V, i, 3.

I did not liue, till now; this my first hower.

Statius, *Sylvae*, iv, ii, 12-3:

steriles transmisimus annos:
Hæc æui mihi prima dies, hæc limina vitæ.

And it is probable that in the first two lines of the scene,

Swell, swell, my ioyes: and faint not to declare
Your selues, as ample, as your causes are,

Jonson has in mind what Statius had said in the lines immediately preceding those quoted, to the effect that he cannot find words to express the joy caused him by being admitted to dine with Domitian.

Jonson refers to part of the passage from Statius in *Part of the King's Entertainment*, which it will be noticed was produced about the same time with *Sejanus*.

V, i, 21-4.

vnlesse
The gods, by mixing in the cause, would blesse
Our fortune with their conquest. That were worth
Sejanus strife, durst fates but bring it forth.

See Capaneus in Statius, *Theb.*, x, 899 ff.:

'Nullane pro trepidis,' clamabat, 'numina Thebis
Statis? ubi infandae segnes telluris alumni,
Bacchus et Alcides? pudet instigare minores.
Tu potius venias (quis enim concurrere nobis
Dignior?' etc.

Volpone

III, i, 11 ff.

almost
All the wise world is little else, in nature,
But Parasites, or Sub-parasites. And, yet,
I meane not those, that haue your bare townne-arte,
To know, who's fit to feede 'hem; haue no house,
No family, no care, and therefore mould
Tales for mens eares, to bait that sense; or get
Kitchin-inuention, and some stale receipts
To please the belly, and the groine; nor those,
With their court-dog-tricks, that can fawne, and fleere,
Make their reuennue out of legs, and faces,

Echo my-Lord, and lick away a moath:
 But your fine, elegant rascall, that can rise . . .
 Present to any humour, all occasion;
 And change a visor, swifter, then a thought.

I rather suspect that Mosca was here recalling Plutarch, *How to tell a Flatterer from a Friend*, Translation of 1870, II, 103-4: "If you would learn the character of a true subtle flatterer, who nicks his point *secundum artem*, you must not, with the vulgar, mistake those sordid smell-feasts and poor trencher-slaves for your men, who begin to prate as soon as they have washed their hands in order to dinner, as one says of them, and ere they are well warmed with a good cut of the first dish and a glass of wine, betray the narrow soul that acts them by the nauseous and fulsome buffoonery they vent at table . . . Nor must we, again, confine our notions of flatterers to those sharpening fellows who ply about rich men's tables, whom neither fire nor sword nor porter can keep from supper; nor yet to such as were those female parasites of Cyprus, who going into Syria were nick-named Steps, because they cringed so to the great ladies of that country that they mounted their chariots on their backs . . . [But] He who neither professes nor seems to flatter; who never haunts your kitchen, is never observed to watch the dial that he may nick your supper-time; who won't drink to excess, but will keep his brains about him," etc.

And p. 107: "But the flatterer . . . leads not a life properly his own, but forms and moulds it according to the various humors and caprices of those he designs to bubble, is never one and the same man, but a mere dapple or trimmer, who changes shapes with his company, like water that always turns and winds itself into the figure of the channel through which it flows." And Plutarch then goes on to develop this theme at length, still keeping in mind the more skilful type of flatterer. That one or two expressions in this speech of Mosca came from Theophrastus is noted by Gifford and by Baldwin (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xvi, 193). I think Holt's belief (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 164 ff., *Notes on Ben Jonson's Volpone*) that the character of Mosca is due to English dramatic tradition might be somewhat modified by examining what Plutarch has to say on the parasite in this essay. For, as Plutarch describes him, the more skilful parasite has just that "rare genius for knavery" upon which Holt lays stress. He complies with his patron in just Mosca's fashion, and displays just the same willingness to feed his

lusts and forward his designs. Elsewhere, as I point out in the article on *Underwoods* mentioned below,² Jonson borrows from this same essay of Plutarch's, a fact which strengthens the suggestion that he had it in mind in the character of Mosca.

IV, i.

Sir Politic's project for the restraint of tinder-boxes in order to safeguard the arsenal would seem to be suggested by Aristophanes, *Acharnians*; the informer brings to light a plot to burn the arsenal with the wick of a lamp which might be fixed on the back of a cockroach, which might float with it into the arsenal, with a north-east wind (cf. Frere's translation). I have not seen Bang's article on the sources of *Volpone* in the *Mélanges Godefroid Kurth*, Liège, 1908. The edition of *Volpone* in the Yale series by L. H. Holt has not yet been printed, but I take it that the editor's chief contributions to the study of sources are in the article above referred to. The edition by Wilkins, mentioned in *Camb. Hist. of Engl. Lit.*, vi, 417, I have not been able to trace.

IV, v. In Voltore's speech at the trial occurs the line,

Mischiefe doth euer end, where it begins.

Whalley very properly conjectured 'never' for 'ever,' and Gifford adopted the conjecture. If Whalley's emendation needs support, the following passage in Valerius Maximus, ix, i, 2, affords it: neque enim ullum vitium finitur ibi, ubi oritur.

WILLIAM DINSMORE BRIGGS.

Stanford University.

² Perhaps it should be said that the article here printed is supplemented by articles on the *Epigrams*, *Forest*, and *Underwoods* already accepted by *Modern Philology* and *Classical Philology*, and by one on *Cynthia's Revels* in the *Flügel Memorial Volume*.

VENICE 1727: SONNETS ON THE EXECUTION OF
DOMENICO ALTHAN

The following sonnets are survivors of a class of literature, the general aspects of which, in relation to the history of Venice, have been described by Professor Medin.¹ But there are still one or two basic facts to recall in connection with them. As far as my observation goes, the population of Venice is divided into two parts: there are those who gossip in prose and there are those who gossip in verse. I have an impression also that the second class far outnumbers the first. But that is only an impression. I am certain only that in Venice—where everyone in his innermost life of emotion and ideals still lives under the old Republic—the spirit of Pasquino is still as vigorously alive as of yore. And to this day, if you get up early in the morning, you will see samples of this same literature pasted on all the conspicuous walls and colonnades of Venice. It is the Venetian way of apprehending things. The versified witticism is for Venetians a form of dialectics by which they spiritually annul the contradiction between their ideals, which are of the remote past, and current events, which are, alas, only too evenly abreast of the times. The vast part of this literature perishes of course. It is usually malicious. It is often obscene. Street-cleaners and policemen are specially commissioned to destroy it. It has to reckon also with the friends of the people it so commonly assails. However, the wittier specimens are sometimes copied and passed around in manuscript. If the victim of a satire is specially unpopular, his caricatures last a long time. President Wilson, last summer, was usually good for a two-day exposure. The brighter things against Giolitti promise actually to outlive the war. If Checo Bepo gets off rather easily it is for another reason. The nightly crop of satire on Austrian matters is so large that all available and desirable wall space is covered at once. And the wit of Tuesday is arrogantly pasted over the wit of Monday, and so on.

Some fragments of such verse on the execution of Count Domenico Althan, Nov. 5, 1727, were published by Molmenti in his essay entitled *Una condanna capitale*.² In adding to this collection, I

¹ *La storia di Venezia nella poesia*, Milano, Hoepli, 1904.

² P. G. Molmenti, *Vecchie storie*, Venezia, Ongania, 1882, pp. 137-146. To this theme Molmenti returns in *I banditi della Repubblica Veneta*.

hope to ease the Senator's mind on one point. He was somewhat concerned because his verses had here and there a foot too many. Mine on the contrary have here and there a foot too few. Taking the series as a whole, we may rest assured that the general average of Pasquino's style will not be lowered. As for Domenico Althan, we may recall that his chief title to fame is that he went to the scaffold with a sense of humor. He was duly shriven by his confessor for the murder of a successful rival in love. He then felt that his accounts were square with God, and spent his few remaining hours evening things up with his enemies in the world. When brought to the block, he adopted tactics of obstructionism, attempting to gain an indefinite respite by a speech indefinitely long. The public was much exercised by a strenuous campaign for a pardon conducted by his relatives; and by a squabble for his clothes between his executioner and the attending monks. Venetian gossip was vociferous on the merits and demerits of these latter questions. On both of them the Council of Ten had the final say. Where did Althan go when he died? Our sonnets throw more heat than light on this problem.

These poems, as they appear in the Cicogna Codex 1197 (Museo Correr, Venice), cc. 201-202, comprise three sonnets not given by Molmenti. The sonnet beginning *Popolo addio* seems to have initiated the polemic, provoking two replies in similar rhyme scheme. Since Molmenti's text for this poem is somewhat imperfect I venture to reproduce the new form of it here, along with the second sonnet printed by Molmenti, which constitutes a parallel with our first reply.

Sopra la morte del conte Althan, 1727

Popolo, addio! Nel gran punto di morte,
Quando l'alma è per render conto a Dio
Di quanto oprò, senza pensier di morte
Disse scherzando Althan: "Popolo, addio."
Che confidenza è questa con la morte?
O pur qual prosonzion folle con Dio,
Meritar su'l patibolo la morte
E baldanzoso dir: "Popolo, addio!"

Firenze, Bemporad, 1898, pp. 210-215, but by a misprint the events are here referred to the year 1726. See also Tassini, *Alcune delle più clamorose condanne capitali eseguite in Venezia sotto la Repubblica*, Venezia, Fontana, 1892, p. 286.

Innocenza di vita pria di morte,
Coscienza netta e gran timor di Dio,
Potria sperar misericordia in morte.

Ma render oltraggiato in vita un Dio,
Il prossimo ridur sin alla morte . . . !
Miserere e non più "Popolo, addio!"

Credete al pensier mio:
Con questa contrizion d'Althan interno,
Nel dir "Popolo addio" piombò all' Inferno.

Risposta al Contrascritto

(*Memento mei dum veneris in regnum tuum!* Luc. XXIII. *Duo ladrones qui crucifigi erant cum eo improperebant ei.* Matt. XXVII.)

Non fia stupor ch'Althan giunto alla morte,
Tempo che l'alma renda conto a Dio,
Dica, quasi scherzando con la morte,
Con intrepido cor: "Popolo, addio."

Confidenza non è sprezzar la morte,
Nè folle prosonzion sperar in Dio.
Anzi, chè su'l patibolo la morte
Pena è dell'alma per meritarsi a Dio.

Due ladri in croce bestemiavan Dio;
Ambedue condannati eran a morte.
Con un *memento* uno sen vola a Dio:—
Sentimenti d'Althan: "Popolo, addio."
"Popolo," volea dir, "il corpo à morte,
L'alma contrito cuor la rende a Dio."

In Risposta al detto Sonnetto

Dunque perchè nel gran punto di morte
Disse già lieto Altan: "Popolo addio?"
Formi sentenza di sua eterna morte,
Quando il giudizio sol s'aspetta a Dio?

Non prese il Conte a scherzo, no, la morte!
Anzi invitto s'offrì vittima a Dio
Per lavar le sue colpe: e in braccio a morte
Corse, fastoso è ver, ma unito a Dio.

Dunque un'Alma che pecca, all'hor che in morte
Grida pietà, non la concede Iddio?
E dee perir d'impenitente morte?

Pecchè l'Altan contro il voler di Dio!
Il prossimo ridusse ancor a morte!
Non ha perciò misericordia Iddio?

Non si conface al tuo pensier il mio.
L'Altan contritto fu da un duol interno,
Nè per dir, "Mondo addio" piombò all'Inferno.

*Mentre fu decapitato il conte Althan a Venezia nel venerdì
Novembre 1727*

Trema al punto di morte un Ilarione
Che settant' anni in penitenza e pianto
Avea servito a Dio. Di Cristo a canto
Muore, invitato al cielo, il buon ladrone.

Althan visse una vita da fellone
E va alla morte come fosse un santo.
Ah! che il morir con quel superbo vanto
D'innocente punito è prosunzione!

Doppo aver accusata la sua sorte
Con temerario ardir, "Popolo," disse
"Addio! Son innocente e vado a morte!"

Ah! s'altri dell' Althan in versi scrisse
Ch'Althan morì da grand' eroe, da forte,
Altri scriva ch'Althan morì qual visse!

Risposta

Gran prosunzion, gran mente fina,
Voler interpretar di Dio i secreti!
Materia de più occulti gabinetti
E pensieri ghe xe che l'indovina.
Chi al cielo, chi all'inferno Althan destina,
Tolendo al suo morir gli ultimi detti:
Vergognatevi! O là, a voi no aspetti
Voler interpretar mente divina!

Vi prego a condannar il corettore,
Sapendo aver ragion! Parlo per questo
Acciò vi ravvediate dell'errore.

Meglio fareste, io ben ve lo protesto,
D'interceder per lui verso il fattore,
E non curarsi di saper il resto.

ARTHUR LIVINGSTON.

Columbia University.

GRIMMELSHAUSEN AS A DIALECTOLOGER

In his *Deutscher Michel*,¹ Grimmelshausen makes some interesting remarks as to the relative value of various German dialects, and after some deliberation, concedes the honor of having the best to the city of Mainz: "Den Ruhm dieser Ehr (das beste und zierlichste deutsch zu reden) hat von langen Zeiten her zwar die Stadt Mayntz gehabt, welches ich ihr als meiner lieben Landsmännin von Herten gern gönnen möchte."

This observation of Grimmelshausen's, that the dialect of Mainz resembles in many important details that of Gelnhausen, his birthplace, has, as Kögel² states, been confirmed by modern investigation. Furthermore, his outspoken preference for the dialect of Mainz would naturally presuppose an intimate knowledge of some of the other dialects. This knowledge he must have acquired while travelling about from one part of the country to the other as soldier and freebooter. We know, *i. e.*, if we accept his *Simplicissimus* as an authentic account of his own adventures, that he spent a considerable time at Soest,³ and during his stay had access to books and enjoyed intercourse with influential people of this region (Cf. *Simplicissimus*, book III, ch. xviii). In like manner, he became acquainted with the Swabian dialect.

Granted then, that Grimmelshausen was interested in the provincial speech⁴ of the localities he visited, it remains for us to find out with what accuracy he observed and recorded the *Bauerndialekte* by means of which he tried to give his anecdotes a touch of local-color.

In the second chapter of the first book of *Simplicissimus*,⁵ Knän, the fosterfather of Simplicius, addresses the latter in the following words:

"Bub bisz flissig, losz di Schoff nit ze wit vunnananger laffen, un spill wacker uff der Sackpiffa, dasz der Wolff nit kom, und Schada

¹ *Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus*, hrsg. von A. v. Keller, (Stuttg. Litt. Verein, Bd. 65) Vol. II, p. 1112.

² *Neudrucke deutscher Litteraturwerke des XVI u. XVII Jhs.* No. 19-25, Halle, 1902, p. ix.

³ Cf. Bechtold, *Grimmelshausen u. seine Zeit*, pp. 11-16.

⁴ Cf. Scholte, *Paul u. Braunes Beiträge* XI, 296.

⁵ *Neudrucke*, No. 19-25, p. 11.

dau, dan he ysz a sölcher veyrboinigter Schelm und Dieb, der Menscha und Vieha frisst, un wan dau awer farlässij bisst, so will eich dir da Buckel arauma." To this Simplicius replies in the same idiom: "Knäno, sag mir aa, wey der Wolff seyhet? Eich hunn noch kan Wolff gesien": "Ah dau grober Eselkopp, dau bleiwest schun su a grusser Dölpel, un waist noch neit, was der Wolff für a veyrfeussiger Schelm isz."

From Simplicissimus' own words, we know that Knän was a native of the Spessart, and may accordingly assume that the dialect which he speaks in the quoted passage is the dialect of this region, probably of Gelnhausen.

We may consider at this point the other passage illustrating this same dialect, namely the words of the Alte Meuder, Simplex's fostermother, in the *Dritte Continuation*:⁶

"Hast dos aufs Feeld ganga und dos Häu aufglogen du Lufft? ist dos nit a Greul, dasz ma dirs Sauffn so gor nit o gwena kon? ich unds Orschala meissen draussen in der Hitz scheir Durst sterben, und du sauffst dau as wei a Berstenbinder, dasz ders dieser a jener ausseng. Und du, Simpel, künst a wul dei Zeit besser ohwenden, wennd a weil da ham säst a machest on deem Colender, asz das da dau sitzt und gleist wei a Kachelufen. Zeig immer widder in Kreig, wenn da mein Alten su verfeiren willt! Isz er do a weila nit a su gewest, nur dei Zeit, dosz du dou bist geits a su liederli her. Fort! packt ich rausser!" Page 335, line 4: "A sauff a weil a Wasser, du Prolhans."

Comparing these passages with the examples of the vulgar dialect of Mainz and the vicinity as found in Firmenich-Richartz,⁷ we note the following points of agreement:

	<i>o</i>	for Literary High German	<i>a</i>	in dos, dosz, kon, losz, schoff.
<i>u</i>	"	"	"	"
<i>a (aa)</i>	"	"	"	<i>o</i> in vun, su, schun, grusser.
<i>w</i>	"	"	"	<i>ei</i> in ham, kan.
<i>nn</i>	"	"	"	<i>b</i> in bleiwest, Lewelang, awer.
	"	"	"	<i>nd</i> in wunner.
<i>is</i>	"	"	"	<i>ist</i>
<i>hun</i>	"	"	"	<i>habe</i> or <i>haben</i>
<i>a</i>	"	"	"	<i>ein</i>
<i>asz</i> or <i>as</i>	"	"	"	<i>als</i>

⁶ *Deutsche Nationallitteratur*, hrsg. v. Kürschner, xxxiv, 334.

⁷ *Germaniens Völkerstimmen, Sammlung der deutschen Mundarten in Dichtungen, Sagen, Märchen, Volksliedern usw.* Berlin, 1843-54, II, 51 ff.

Infinitives and past participles of strong verbs without *n*, *arauma*, *wera*, *ganga*.

Of more importance than these details, which are also found in other dialects, are the forms *eich* and *meich* for *ich* and *mich*. These forms are peculiar to this region, as is also the form *aa* or *â* for the diphthong *au*. (Cf. *MLN*, xxxi, 77) *Au* first becomes *aa* *i. e.*, long *â* then shortened to *a*. Cf. *laffen* for *laufen*. Firmenich-Richartz, page 54: *eich glabs, glawe* (page 56) by the side of *laafe, geglaabt, iberhaapt*.

The pronoun *he* for *er* is occasionally found in the vicinity of the Vogelsberg. (Cf. Firmenich-Richartz, II, 107, 'Fulda und die Umgegend') Likewise is the imperative *biss* for *sei* frequently met with, tho in nowise limited to this region. (Cf. Kehrein, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, I. Teil, § 385.)

The Swabian Dialect.—After his escape from the Mummelsee (book v, ch. 17), Simplicissimus unexpectedly comes upon a group of men in a nearby forest, sitting around a fire, and addresses them before they are aware of his presence. As soon as one of their number sufficiently recovers from his sudden fright, he cries out: "Wear ischt dan der Hair?" "Da hörete ich," remarks Simplex, "dass es eine Schwäbische Nation seyn müste."

In the eighth chapter of the same book, Grimmelshausen lets a peasant in the Saurbrunn speak in a similar dialect. Upon being asked whence he obtained the goat he is leading along, the peasant replies: "Gnädiger Hearr, eich darfs ouch werli neit sän." Three times in the course of the conversation does the peasant address Simplex with the words "Ja Hearr"; and once he uses the form *säit* for the third person singular of *sagen*.

The diphthong *ea* in *Hearr*, *Wearr* is markedly Swabian.⁸ (Cf. Firmenich-Richartz, II, 434-50) Swabian is also *scht* for *st* as in *ischt* = *ist*.⁹ Adverbs in *-li(le)* for *-lich* are the rule.¹⁰ The third person singular *säit* is common. (Cf. Firmenich-Richartz, II, 438.)

Low German.—The soldiers that drove the fosterparents out of their home in the Spessart speak a Low German dialect: "Jung,

⁸ Kauffmann, *Geschichte der schwäbischen Mundart*, Strassburg 1890, p. 58.

⁹ Ibid. § 153, c, Anm. 2, and *Anzeiger f. d. Alt.*, xxiv, 268.

¹⁰ Ibid. § 108, h.

kom heröfer, oder skall my de Tüfel halen, ick schiete dik, dat di de Damff thom ¹¹ Hals ut gaht."

The mad ensign in thirteenth chapter of the second book replies to Simplicissimus in the following words: "Wat wolts met deesem Kerl sin, hey hett den Tüfel in Liff, hey ist beseeten, de Tüfel de kühret ut jehme."

The moor in the trough (book III, chap. 8) implores Simplex to spare his life: "Min leve Heer, ick bidde ju doer Gott, schinkt mi min Levend!"

The simple-minded inhabitants, whenever they see the *Jäger von Soest* riding thru the town, remark (chap. 12): "Min God, wat vor en prave Kerl is mi dat!"

The people in the vicinity of Soest call Simplicissimus "dat Jäjerken" (book II, chap. 29).

The principal criteria here are naturally the unshifted *t* in *schiete, dat, wat, thom, ut, beseeten*; the personal pronouns *ick, dik, ju, jehme, mi, di*; the diminutive *-ken*, and the third person singular *is*. A narrow localization of the dialect represented is impossible because of insufficient text. But there is nothing in the last three passages quoted that would prevent our accepting the author's own localization in Soest. In the first passage, the form *skall* would seem to point to the region northeast of Soest. Cf. Lasch,¹² § 443, who remarks that the forms with *c(k)* and *ch* are principally Eastfalian.¹³ But the numerous exceptions to this statement preclude any absolute fixation of place. The same might almost be said of the double accusative-forms *dik* and *mi* (Tümpel, § 17), and the form *hett* (Tümpel, § 23, p. 108) for the more usual *heft, hefft, hevet*. For the form *jehme* (for *öhme* or *ehme?*), cf. Lasch, § 175, and Tümpel, § 19, page 95. Note the form *doer* for High German *durch*. (Cf. Firmenich-Richartz I, 290; Lasch, § 156.) *Gaht* (*gat*) is according to Lasch, § 448, 2 common only in western Westfalia. Cf. Firmenich-Richartz, I, 346 for the forms *hey, met, halen*. *Kühret* in the sense of *speak* is a good Low German word. (Cf. Firmenich-Richartz I, 298.) The forms *Tüfel, Damff*, and *Gott* are evidently High German; Low German would be *Düvel, Damp*, and *God*.

¹¹ In the editions A, D, G, R; the others have *zum*.

¹² *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik* von Agathe Lasch, Halle 1914.

¹³ *Niederdeutsche Studien* von H. Tümpel, Bielefeld u. Leipzig 1898, p. 110.

In the twenty-third chapter of the third book of *Simplicissimus*, we again meet with a few lines in a Low German idiom. Somewhere 'im Bergischen Land,' probably in the vicinity of Gladbach northeast of Cologne, Grimmelshausen places the scene of action. A swineherd brings upon himself the wrath of his father, when he is heard swearing at the swine, "dass sie der Donner und Hagel erschlagen und *de Tüfel dartho halen skolde*. Der Bauer hörete seinem Sohn zu, lieff derowegen mit seinem Brügel aus dem Haus und schrie: Halt, du hundert tausend usw. Schelm, *ick sall di lehren sweren, de Hagel schla di dan, dat di der Tüfel int Liff fahr, . . . Du böse Bof, ick sall di leeren floeken, de Tüfel hal di dan, ick sall di im Arse lecken, ick sall di leeren dine Mour brühen.*"

We note here again the *k* in *skolde* as above in *skall*, but also the more usual Westfalian form *sall* for the first person present indicative. The loss of the spirant in *schlā* is common in Low German. Cf. Lasch, § 351. The fusion of preposition + article *in* + *dat* = *int* is regular. Cf. Tümpel, page 125; Firmenich-Richartz I, 346. The loss of intervocalic *d* as in *Mour* for *Moder*, older *Modor*, 'Mutter,' is already observed in old texts. Cf. Lasch, § 326; Firmenich-Richartz I, 445.

This brief study, I hope, has revealed another side of Grimmelshausen's linguistic skill. The accuracy of his observation is astonishing. Rarely¹⁴ in the earlier German literature do we find such attention paid to the provincial speech of various parts of Germany. This fact proves as clearly and conclusively as does Grimmelshausen's intimate knowledge of the localities and local conditions and customs he describes (Bechtold, pp. 11-16), that he was in each case an eye-witness, and not merely gleaned his knowledge from books and hearsay.

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

Delaware College.

¹⁴Some of the better known attempts to introduce the vulgar dialect prior to Grimmelshausen are: (1) Wierstraats *Chronik von Neuss*, hrsg. v. Groote (1885); cf. Braune, *Beiträge* I, 18-20; (2) the comedies of Heinrich Julius v. Braunschweig (cf. Goedeke, *Grundriss* II, 519-521); (3) a poem consisting of 91 strophes, *Stynchyn van der Krone*, published by Birlinger and Crecelius in the *Mittel- u. niederdeutsche Dialektproben*. (*Altdeutsche Neujaarsblätter für 1874*) Wiesbaden 1874.

SAINT-PIERRE AND BALZAC

Students of Balzac are cognizant of the fact that even in his best work the great French realist shows his indebtedness to many novelists who preceded him. Faguet sees in him "un Eugène Suë, un Soulié et un mauvais élève de Ballanche."¹ Brunetière recognizes Ducray-Duminil, Pigault-Lebrun and others as predecessors. Louis Morel in a critique of a new work, *Balzac*, by Hans Heiss, Heidelberg, enumerates a large number of authors whose influence on Balzac is apparent, noting especially Byron. M. Morel criticises the study for failure to treat adequately the novels of Balzac published before the *Comédie humaine*, from 1822-1825, "nécessaires . . . à l'intelligence de la *Comédie humaine* et dans lesquels on trouve les tendances et les procédés qui rattachent Balzac au romantisme."² André Le Breton dwells at length on the influence of Anne Radcliffe, Lewis and Maturin, particularly in the early works,³ and notes also the more superficial effects of Rousseau, Mme. Cottin, Mme. de Staël, Nodier, Shakespeare and Byron.⁴

One literary creditor of Balzac seems to have escaped the notice of investigators. I refer to Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, whose *Paul et Virginie* Balzac quite consciously imitated in his early novel *le Vicaire des Ardennes*, 1822. M. Le Breton who has given the closest attention to the origins of Balzac, makes no mention of Saint-Pierre. Perhaps it is because he passed over the *Vicaire des Ardennes* more completely even than his words indicate. He dismisses it as an "œuvre imitée du *Moine* de Lewis et du même type que les précédentes, mais informe, mais illisible, et si scandaleuse que le gouvernement en fit arrêter la vente et détruire les exemplaires qui restaient en magasin."⁵ In those "œuvres de jeunesse" which M. Le Breton has cited, there is nothing which is at once so clear and so extensive an imitation as the section from the *Vicaire des Ardennes*.

Paul et Virginie appears to have long been a favorite with Balzac. In the *Curé de Village*, 1839, he terms it "l'un des plus touchants

¹ Emile Faguet, *Balzac*, 1913, p. 129.

² *Herrigs Archiv*, 133, p. 196.

³ André Le Breton, *Balzac l'Homme et l'Œuvre*, Chap. 2 (Paris, 1905).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

livres de la langue française." In the *Vicaire des Ardennes*, however, he does more; he incorporates the entire romance, with a few changes in names, places and details into his own novel. He uses it as an account of the early life of his hero Joseph, who presents it in journal form.

The life of Joseph and Mélanie on the island of Martinique differs only in details from that of Paul and Virginia on the Ile de France. Joseph and Mélanie are nine and five years old respectively, when they are first brought together, and their companionship on the island lasts seven years. Paul and Virginia were fifteen years old at the time of their separation. In each story, the interest lies in following the simple daily life of two children, isolated from society in a tropical garden-spot. Their mothers in the one case and their foster-mother in the other, with a few negro slaves, are almost the only other characters to appear. The settings are practically the same; tropical and primitive, with a wealth of exotic flowers, fruits and animals.

The difference in the length of the two stories is considerable. *Paul et Virginie* is a novel of about 150 pages, whereas the episode in the *Vicaire des Ardennes* covers some 22 pages, leaving in the former much more room for detail. Balzac's story is given in journal form, which again causes slight differences.

The virtual identity of characters, circumstances and setting which is evident at first glance, is of no greater significance, however, than the minor resemblances which appear upon closer scrutiny. Of these the following are the most striking:

Paul et Virginie, page 57,⁶ "Quand on en rencontrait un quelque part, on était sûr que l'autre n'était pas loin." *Vicaire des Ardennes*, page 91,⁷ "Où l'on apercevait Mélanie, on était sûr de me trouver, car nous n'allions jamais l'un sans l'autre." *P. et V.*, p. 57, *Toute leur étude était de se complaire et de s'entr'aider.* *V. des A.*, p. 91, "Un quart d'heure d'absence devenait un supplice pour tous deux, et notre plus chère étude fut de nous complaire l'un à l'autre."

P. et V., p. 57, "Si dans ces courses, une belle fleur, un bon fruit ou un nid d'oiseau se présentaient à lui, eussent-ils été au haut d'un

⁶ *Oeuvres complètes de Jacques Henri Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*, Vol. 6.

⁷ H. de Balzac, *Oeuvres de Jeunesse*, *Le Vicaire des Ardennes*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris, 1878.

arbre, il l'escaladait pour les apporter à sa sœur." *V. des A.*, pp. 90-91, "Je l'emmenais dans *mes courses*, que je proportionnais à ses forces naissantes, et *chaque belle fleur* que je rencontrais lui était offerte comme jouet; *chaque beau fruit, chaque nid d'oiseau* arrivait dans ses belles mains avant qu'elle eût le temps de le désirer."

P. et V., p. 100, "Quand je t'eus prise *sur mon dos*, il me semblait que j'avais des ailes comme un oiseau . . . p. 102, Et avec son petit mouchoir blanc, elle lui *essuyait le front* et les joues, et elle lui donnait plusieurs baisers." *V. des A.*, p. 91, "*A mon dos*, je portais ma soeur jusqu'à la maison; cette jolie fille me passait ses bras autour du cou, . . . et mon cœur palpitait de joie lorsque je sentais la douce main de Mélanie qui *essuyait la sueur de mon front*."

P. et V., p. 143, "La solitude ramène en partie l'homme au bonheur naturel, en éloignant de lui le malheur social." . . . words from a long disquisition on the advantages of solitude. *V. des A.*, p. 86, "Elle . . . a dit, que les hommes naissent bons, et qu'en les préservant de la civilisation on leur donne, par cette seule et simple précaution, la plus belle éducation possible."

"Nègres marrons," runaway slaves in hiding, are frequently mentioned in both narratives. *P. et V.*, p. 64, "Une *négresse maronne* se présenta" and follows the episode of the "noirs marons" who carry the children home on their shoulders. *V. des A.*, p. 87, "trahir un *nègre marron* qui venait se réfugier dans les montagnes" . . . p. 88 "Souvent je parvenais dans l'autre du *nègre marron*."

P. et V., p. 67, "L'idée lui vint de *mettre le feu au pied* de ce palmiste." *V. des A.*, p. 96, "Aussitôt, sept à huit nègres *mettent le feu au pied* d'une trentaine d'arbres, qui ne tardent pas à tomber."

P. et V., p. 59, "Une nourriture saine et abondante *développait rapidement les corps* de ces deux jeunes gens, et une éducation douce peignait dans leur physionomie la pureté et le contentement de leur âme. *Virginie n'avait que douze ans; déjà sa taille était plus qu'à demi formée; de grands cheveux blonds* ombrageaient sa tête; *ses yeux bleus* et ses lèvres de corail brillaient du plus tendre éclat sur la fraîcheur de son visage. *V. des A.*, p. 94, "*Nos corps* n'étant pas déformés par les habillements ridicules qu'exige le séjour des villes, *se développèrent rapidement*, et les belles proportions que la nature, livrée à elle-même, enfante sans efforts, nous donnèrent les vains

avantages de la beauté. *Mélanie atteignit douze ans. Sa jolie taille était presque formée; elle se regardait déjà dans l'eau claire des fontaines pour arranger les milliers de boucles que formaient ses beaux cheveux blonds. Ses yeux bleus souriaient toujours, et pourtant exprimaient la mélancolie.*"

P. et V., p. 99, "Il n'y avait point de jour qu'ils ne se communiquassent quelques secours ou quelques lumières." *V. des A.*, p. 91, "Nous lisions ensemble ce qu'il a écrit sur la voûte des cieux, ce qu'il a tracé sur les sables de la mer," etc. Here the actual relation is not so apparent in the words. The idea of their growth, unaffected by any evil, in the most natural and primitive way, however, is emphasized in the two stories. In each case they are compared to Adam and Eve, *P. et V.*, p. 99, *V. des A.*, p. 102.

The change from childish love to the deeper passion of adolescence is treated in exactly the same way. Both Mélanie and Virginie are swayed by an awakening shyness, and each avoids her companion. *P. et V.*, p. 102, "Cependant, depuis quelque temps, Virginie se sentait agitée d'un mal inconnu. . . . On la voyait tout-à-coup gaie sans joie, et triste sans chagrin . . . quelquefois . . . un rouge vif colorait ses joues pâles, et ses yeux n'osaient plus s'arrêter sur les siens." *V. des A.*, p. 102, "Quelque temps après cet événement, ma soeur, qui croissait en grâce et en beauté, et dont l'esprit était au moins à la hauteur des perfections du corps, devint aussi rêveuse, et son charmant visage se couvrait parfois d'une rougeur subite . . . (she says, p. 103) *je n'ose plus te regarder qu'en secret, c'est-à-dire lorsque tu ne me vois point.*"

I have omitted a number of resemblances which are less clear than those mentioned, or more obviously unrelated. There seem to be no specific borrowings from the descriptions of natural scenery, altho they are of the same general character. Very special and frequent emphasis on the innocence and simplicity of the children is to be noted in both stories. A last mark of resemblance between them is the tragic end of the romance.

GEORGE S. BARNUM.

University of Minnesota.

REVIEWS

The English Essay and Essayists. By HUGH WALKER, M. A.,
LL. D. London and Toronto, J. M. Dent & Sons; New York,
E. P. Dutton & Co., 1915.

Professor Hugh Walker's *The English Essay and Essayists* is the pioneer attempt to present a complete survey of a literary type that has been most widely cultivated in England during the last three centuries. Within the twelve chapters ranging from "Anticipations of the Essay" to "Some Essayists of Yesterday," Professor Walker considers the writings of all British essayists not now living whom he deems of any consequence. As was to be expected in a first edition of such a survey, a number of writers have been omitted who unquestionably should have received consideration.¹ The inclusion, however, of a very considerable number of writings that cannot be classed as essays, if the term essay is to have any proper signification, indicates an inability to hold to some reasonably consistent definition of the genre. A rigid definition may be impracticable; but the writer who selects for study the essay as a type must, in his treatment at least, distinguish it amid all the varieties of miscellaneous prose. This Professor Walker has not done with any degree of consistency; apparently he feels free to treat as an essay any prose composition that interests him, provided that it is not a full and closely articulated treatise, whether or not custom has assigned to it the name of essay.

The consequence of this attitude appears most strikingly in the chapter on "Miscellaneous Essayists of the Seventeenth Century," in which are considered the essays of Felltham, Cowley, Temple, and Halifax together with such incongruous writings as Sir Thomas Browne's *Vulgar Errors*, the *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae*, Milton's *Areopagitica*, and all Dryden's critical prose. To regard the *Areopagitica* and the various chapters of *Vulgar Errors* as essays is to ignore both form and writer's intent. Similarly, to consider the *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae* as a collection of essays is to confuse two dis-

¹ A review in *The Nation* for July 22, 1915, notes a number of the more important omissions, a number which might be enlarged by almost any serious student of the essay.

tinct genres and to misinterpret literary history.² Dryden's example in the cultivation of a natural, easy style was of undoubted consequence in the development of English prose, inclusive of the essay, and warrants consideration of Dryden's writings. But if all his "discourses, apologies, defenses, prefaces, dedications, and postscripts" are to be regarded as essays, then the historian of the genre must take account of the unnumbered myriads of prefaces, introductions, dedications, and so forth that appeared before Dryden's day and have appeared since. In consequence partly of this failure to distinguish the essay from other forms of prose, partly of a failure to trace accurately genetic relations, the whole work does not present an ordered account of the development of the essay as a distinct type or of the different varieties within the type.

Apparently Professor Walker's own interest is very largely in the individual essayists. Occasionally he makes a careful analysis of style and of content, such as the analysis of Bacon's later essays and of the seventeenth-century character; occasionally he is chiefly concerned with the personality of the essayists, as in the case of Steele and Addison, of Goldsmith, and of Hazlitt; but most frequently he presents only a somewhat impressionistic appreciation of a writer or of his work. In the case of the writers whom he regards as the most significant or the most attractive, his comment or analysis is accompanied by extensive excerpts, which as a rule are happily illustrative of the best, though not always the most characteristic, work of the essayists.³

As in this volume Professor Walker does not greatly concern himself with the methods and the results of research, he presents very little new material. He does, however, at times emphasize qualities that hitherto have not been brought into such high relief. He insists, for example, that Goldsmith was most remarkable as a powerful and original thinker and that Lamb's greatest quality

² On these letters and their relation to contemporary epistolography, see Georg Jürgens, "Die Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae," in *Marburger Studien zur englischen Philologie*, I, Marburg, 1901. This study does not, however, attempt to treat fully the interest in letter-writing in England during the latter half of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth century.

³ In order to illustrate Dr. Johnson's critical papers in the *Rambler* it is absurd, however, to quote a passage not from the *Rambler* but from the preface to Shakespeare.

was his wisdom, and he derives Hazlitt the essayist directly from Hazlitt the metaphysician and painter.

The greatest weakness of the volume as a historical study is its far from satisfactory treatment of origins and literary relations. This weakness is especially apparent in the accounts of the essay at the most critical periods—those of the beginnings of the genre in England, of the development of the periodical essay, and of the transformation of the type in the early years of the nineteenth century.

Chapter I credits Bacon with introducing the essay into England, "the name and the thing alike," through the publication of his ten brief *Essays* in 1597. It also considers "anticipations of the essay" in England anterior to the work of Bacon, and attempts to trace the beginnings of the type along "the line which leads to the character-writing of the seventeenth century, the line of criticism, and the line of polemics." Not one of these lines led even in the direction of Bacon's essays, and only that leading to the writing of characters was of any consequence in the early history of the essay. And the *Essays* of 1597 introduced not the thing but merely the name; they were essays only in the strictly Baconian sense of "dispersed meditations," and writings of the same character had been current in England previously.

M. Pierre Villey has shown⁴ that the essay as it was cultivated by Montaigne was an outgrowth of the humanistic efforts to make accessible the knowledge and ideas of antiquity, particularly such as concerned moral ideas and questions of conduct. This interest produced a long line of collections of "sentences" or moral maxims, apothegms or "sentences" put into the mouths of historical personages, and illustrative "examples" culled from the historians and the moralists. At first, material of these kinds was merely grouped for convenience under general headings; later, "sentences" and "examples" were united with comment and application in a form more nearly approaching literature. This latter type of composition was called in France the *leçon morale*. When Montaigne began to write, he followed closely the established mode; the first of his *Essais* differed in no essential from the *leçons morales*. The personal, self-revelatory essays were a gradual evolution, resulting

⁴ *Les sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne*. 2 vols. Hachette et Cie., Paris, 1908. See particularly vol. II, chap. I.

in part from Montaigne's situation and temperament, in part from his interest in Plutarch's *Moralia*.

Bacon's *Essayes* of 1597⁵ belonged to the general type of compilations of "sentences."⁶ Like these compilations, they were

⁵ A large proportion of these *Essayes* may well have been written some time before they were published. In *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, Bk. VI, chap. iii (see also *The Advancement of Learning*, Bk. II, section 18) Bacon inserts groups of "sentences" which he declares he had collected in his youth. "Sentences" of exactly the same kind very largely made up most of the essays of 1597, and a number of the "sentences" contained in *De Augmentis* are imbedded in the essays of 1612 and 1625. Indeed, more than one of the later essays is but little else than the amplification of the ideas expressed in these youthful "sentences."

⁶ On the subject of "sentences" in Europe generally and in France particularly, see Villey as above, vol. II, pp. 8 ff. Evidence is abundant as to the popularity of the same kind of composition in England. The most cursory examination of the *Hand Lists of English Printers 1501-1556* (4 parts, The Bibliographical Society, London, 1895-1913) and the *Stationers' Register* will show in the sixteenth century a very large number of printings of such works as the *Distichs of Cato* and the *Adagia* of Erasmus, the latter either complete or in selections, particularly in Taverner's English translation. The second volume of the *Stationers' Register* has the following entries of other similar compilations: Feb. 25, 1577—the *flowers of Epigrammes* collectyd by Tymothie Kendall; April 26, 1578—the *Rudimentes of Reason gathered out of the preceptes of the worthie and learned philosopher PERILANDER* by JHON PHILLIPS; Jan. 5, 1579—*Apophthegmatum ex optimis utriusque linguæ scriptoribus per Conradum LYCOSTHENEM Rubeaqueensem collectorem loci communes denuo aucti et recogniti: Cum Parabolis sive similitudinibus olim ex gravissimis auctoribus Collectis nunc vero per C LYCOSTHENEM in locos communes digestis*; June 7, 1580—the *nosegaie of morall philosophie*. Translated by THOMAS CREWE; Oct. 17, 1580—A booke of notes and common places with their expositions collected and gathered out of the woorkes of diverse singular writers and brought alphabetically into order by JOHN MARBECKE; Feb. 13, 1581—A Brief Collection of all the Notable and Materiall thinges Conteined in the historye of GUICCIARDIN, being verie necessarie for parliament Councell, Treatises and Negociacons; Jan. 15, 1582—*Le Jardin de vertu et bonnes meurs* par J. B. gent; Nov. 28, 1583—the *welspringe of wyttie and philosophical Sentences*; Nov. 15, 1589—JUSTI LIPSI *politicorum Libri Sex*; May 29, 1590—JUSTI LIPSIJ *Centuria secunda*; July 10, 1590—The sixe bookes of *Politiques* wrytten by JUSTUS LIPSIUS, to be prynted in Englishe adominge to the French Copye; Dec. 6, 1591—*parte prima Delle brevi Dimonstratoni et precetti utilissimi De Diversi propositi morali politici et Ieconomici* Da PETRUCCIO UBALDINI; Nov. 18, 1594—HUGONIS PLATTI *Manuale sententias aliquot divinas et morales complectens partim e sacris patribus partim e patriarcha philosophi*, etc.

merely juxtaposed maxims or aphorisms collected under general headings, without organized composition, concrete illustration, or the slightest personal element. They differed from most of the collections in vogue chiefly in that they did not purport to be drawn from the writings of the ancients, and that they were concerned not so much with general moral subjects as with matters of practical policy. Accordingly, the *Essayes* of 1597 constituted no literary genre new to England, and neither their "general conception" nor their "form" was taken from Montaigne; to Montaigne they were indebted merely for the name.

The treatment of Bacon's later essays is also unsatisfactory in several respects. It presents no definite information as to the greatly increased number of essays in the editions of 1612 and 1625. It implies that the essays of 1612 as a body, like those of 1625, were more ordered, more fully developed, more adorned, whereas a number of the essays first published in 1612 differed in no essential particular from those of 1597, and even certain essays that first appeared in 1625 differed from those of 1597 chiefly in being more coherent. And it ascribes such changes as appeared in the form of the later essays solely to Bacon's individually changed conception of the character of the essay, a change resulting from the popularity of his earlier writings and his sense of responsibility for "having naturalized in England a new species of literature." In *The Advancement of Learning* (1605) and *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (1623),⁷ Bacon makes it clear that he was familiar with both the more amplified method of composition and the aphoristic method, and that as late as 1623 he had fully as much regard for the latter method as for the former. But it is particularly in the essays of 1625 that Bacon's work comes more closely to resemble Montaigne's; it is in these later essays if anywhere that Montaigne's influence is apparent.⁸ Some part, too,

⁷ See *Advancement of Learning*, Bk. II, section xvii, and *De Augmentis*, Bk. VI, chap. II.

⁸ My colleague, Professor Crane, has in preparation a paper on the development of Bacon as essayist, and it has been through him that my attention has been called to some of the particulars noted above. Thus far the one really notable study of the sources and the literary influences upon Bacon's essays and the changes apparent in the style of the essays themselves is M. Pierre Villey's "Montaigne a-t-il eu quelque influence sur François Bacon?" in the *Revue de la Renaissance*, XII (1911), 121-158.

in the naturalization of the essay in England must be allowed to Florio's translation of Montaigne, of which the first printing appeared in 1603, and to the *Essays* of Sir William Cornwallis, very popular in their day, which first appeared in 1600 and 1601 and acknowledged their great indebtedness to those of Montaigne.⁹

In the account of the Queen Anne essayists, Professor Walker very properly emphasizes the importance of Steele. Indeed, he declares that the periodical essay was born of Steele's brain, and he apparently regards Steele's Irish blood as the most important single influence upon the character of the type. Some of the more important literary influences he notes—the *Mercure Scandale*, the *Athenian Gazette*, Cowley's *Essays*, the *Epistolae Ho-Eliauae*; others equally significant, however, he leaves entirely out of account. For example, though in an earlier chapter he had presented an admirable account of the seventeenth-century character-writings, he nowhere hints at the very considerable influence of this form of composition upon the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* and their successors.¹⁰ Nor does he mention La Bruyère's *Caractères*, despite the fact that Steele himself in the ninth number of the *Tatler* followed a declaration of intention to imitate La Bruyère by a character in his manner. In both the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* a very large proportion of the papers that treat social relations are patterned directly upon the work of La Bruyère, the imitation extending to the preference of Greek and Latin above English names for the

185-203, and XIII (1912), 21-46, 61-82. The single unfavorable criticism to be passed upon this study is that it assumes a too consistent direction of change in the character of Bacon's essays in the different editions.

⁹ Professor Walker's whole treatment of the influence of Montaigne upon the essay in England is most inadequate. Not only does he fail to note the three reprintings of Florio's translation between 1603 and 1632, and the same number of printings of Cotton's translation between 1685 and 1700, but he merely alludes indirectly to the influence of Montaigne upon Cowley, he does not in any way connect Montaigne with Sir William Temple, and he wholly ignores the very vital influence of Montaigne upon the greater essayists of the early nineteenth century.

¹⁰ See E. C. Baldwin, "The Relation of the Seventeenth Century Character to the Periodical Essay," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XIX (N. S. xii), 75-114. The indebtedness of the periodical essayists to the character-writers is considerably greater than Professor Baldwin makes to appear, as his article is concerned with an attempt to connect the character and the realistic novel fully as much as to show the relationship of the character and the periodical essay.

illustrative characters.¹¹ Moreover this account leaves entirely out of consideration numerous other influences that had no small share in determining both the manner and the matter of the periodical essay. Such, for example, are the mode of publication, the necessity of adapting the character of the essay to a circle of readers very different in their wide variety of tastes from the much smaller group of essay readers in the preceding century, the coffee-house club life, of which both the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* professed to be the peculiar organs, and the vigorous reaction against social license, which affected the character of the papers in the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* fully as much as it was strengthened by these writings.¹² Finally, though Professor Walker treats the periodical essay as a distinct species, he has not attempted to make clear its distinctive characteristics; except in scattered implications he presents very little information concerning either the subjects of the essays or the form and manner of presentation. Indeed, the great weakness of the section is the absence of definite information of all kinds.

This lack of analysis, this failure to make clear even to himself the peculiar characteristics—apart from publication as separate numbers of periodicals—that mark the essays of the *Tatler* and *Spectator* type handicaps Professor Walker greatly in his account of the development of a different type of essay in the early years of the nineteenth century. It is probably responsible, at least in part, for a failure to observe the remarkable persistence of the earlier type. The merely incidental statement that Drake, whose researches extended only to 1809, noted fifty or more papers after the *Observer* (1785-1790) does not bring out the strength of the Spectatorean tradition. Essays directly in the manner of Addison or Johnson or Goldsmith, with all the machinery of their eighteenth-century models, continued to appear in considerable numbers until about the twenties, when the more individual, less socialized, less artifi-

¹¹ Professor E. C. Baldwin's "La Bruyère's Influence upon Addison" in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XIX (N. S. xii), 479-495, considers only the possible influence of La Bruyère upon the style of Addison and upon the individualized portraits of the members of the Spectator Club.

¹² On the last two points Harold Routh has written admirably in the chapter on Steele and Addison in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. IX, chap. ii.

cial writings of Lamb and Hunt and Hazlitt displaced them in favor. Nor was this eighteenth-century tradition carried on solely by amateurs and the lesser drudges. Professor Walker calls attention to some of the evidences of Leigh Hunt's relationship to the Queen Anne essayists—his kinship to them in spirit, his *Round Table* established in imitation of the *Tatler*, and, by implication, his occasional similarity of subject. He might have noted further that Hunt's earliest essays were a confessed imitation of those in the *Connoisseur* (1754-1756), that such publications of his as the *Indicator* and the *Companion* were essentially modernized *Spectators*, and that his characters derive directly from the creations of Addison and Steele and from the seventeenth-century characters. The influence of the character-writers and of the eighteenth-century essayists upon Lamb, obvious as it is, Professor Walker has not noted at all. Lamb's first essay, "The Londoner," is patently reminiscent of the *Spectator*, as are a number of his papers in the *Reflector* (1811-1812); for example, "Hospita on Immoderate Indulgence," "Hissing at the Theatres," and "A Bachelor's Complaint of the Behavior of Married People." The influence of the eighteenth century extends even to the *Elia* essays, the similarity to Steele, for example, being manifest in "The Wedding," and Lamb himself condemning the "Vision of Horns" as "resembling the most labored papers in the *Spectator*." Very close imitations of the characters appeared in "The Good Clerk" published in the *Reflector* and in the first section of "Poor Relations" in the *Last Essays of Elia*.

Professor Walker ascribes the decay of the eighteenth-century essay to the diversion of intellects of the first order from this kind of writing to other forms of expression—the novel and a new type of essay. Whether the rise of the novel brought about the decline of the essay is at least problematic, as in the eighteenth century Fielding and Goldsmith were as distinguished in both kinds of writing as were Thackeray and Stevenson in the nineteenth. Nor is it quite reasonable to ascribe the decay of the periodical essay to the rise of a different type, for the former had been moribund for decades before the appearance of the latter. Moreover, some of the writers—such as Lamb—most influential in the establishment of the newer type had cultivated the older. The decay of the periodical essay was due to its being so fixed and conventionalized a literary genre that it offered only the narrowest opportunity for

originality and the expression of individuality. The essays of the *Tatler* and *Spectator* had largely exhausted the possibilities of the form both in matter and in manner of presentation; accordingly until the type was radically changed, except for such slight modifications in diction, emphasis, or point of view as those introduced by Johnson and Goldsmith, nothing remained but direct imitation. It was this condition that repelled genius and produced the decay of the periodical essay.

Apparently Professor Walker considers the *Gentleman's Magazine* in some way responsible for the transformation of the essay, though he does not make clear just how it effected the change. As a matter of fact, the *Gentleman's* and magazines patterned after it, such as the *European*, tended much more to preserve the old than to encourage the new; and it was in newspapers and in these magazines that the eighteenth-century variety of essay survived longest. The transformation of the essay is to be attributed very largely to a new kind of magazine—such as *Blackwood's*, the *London*, and the revived *New Monthly*—which differed from the *Gentleman's* as much in composition as in vigor.

In certain other considerable particulars the treatment of the early nineteenth-century essayists, especially Hazlitt, is confusing or defective. Simply because Hazlitt collaborated with Leigh Hunt in the *Round Table*, he is treated with Hunt as illustrating the transition from the manner of the eighteenth century, though Professor Walker enters a disclaimer against considering them of the same "school."¹³ Moreover despite the facts that Hazlitt did not attain his characteristic manner until after the establishment of the modern magazine and that his most productive period was contemporaneous with that of Lamb, he is disposed of in Chapter VII, before the new reviews are mentioned in Chapter VIII and the new magazines in Chapter IX. Further, though neither Hazlitt nor Hunt began to write until after the opening of the nineteenth century, the survey of the work of both is followed by accounts of Paine and of Godwin, both of them eighteenth-century essayists, and the former dead years before Hazlitt had written a single essay.

¹³ Lamb might properly have been treated with Hunt as a transitional essayist, and the mechanical connection between the two through Lamb's connection with the *Reflector* and his contributions to the *Indicator* is as close as that between Hazlitt and Hunt.

two forms which survive longest are *sahe* and *wurde*. The former was still given in the much-respected dictionary of Adelung (1774 and 1793) and even in Campe's dictionary (1810) as the only form of the preterite of *sehen*, but it has since gone out of use; *wurde*, on the other hand, has survived and has largely driven out *ward*, though in consequence of a slight semantic difference which has sprung up between the two forms, they will probably continue side by side in higher diction.

In explanation of the origin of the lengthened forms several distinct influences have been suggested. (1) That of the weak verbs: *sahe* = *lobte*. This has been accepted by several grammarians as a sufficient explanation, and the imperatives of strong verbs in *-e* on the model of those of weak verbs have been cited as an analogous case: *siehe* = *lobe*. The strong verbs in *-t* have been mentioned as those from which this influence might more especially have proceeded: *borste*, *schalte* = *lobte*. On the basis of this explanation these forms may be called "mixed preterites." (2) The influence of the subjunctive. This could not have been strong in any case, as the subjunctive is used so much less than the indicative. (3) The influence of the present tense: *sahe* = *sehe*. This would at most apply to the first person, not to the third; but as far as Professor Rein's lists show, there is no evidence that the epenthetical *-e* was found first and more often in the first person; rather the contrary. In general, the present tense of strong verbs seems to have reacted little upon the preterite; for instance, forms like *gabt* for *gab* on the analogy of *gibt* are extremely rare. (4) In the verbs ending in a media, the desire to prevent the change to the tenuis if the media became final: *warde* for *wart*. As purpose is known to play a minimal part in the creation of linguistic forms, all that could possibly be claimed on this score is that of two existing forms *warde* and *wart* the former was preferred because it agreed with the present tense in the matter of the *d*. But it would not explain the genesis of *warde*, nor throw any light on the numerous *kame*, *verlore*, etc. Besides, German is full of sound-interchanges like *d: t*, *b: p*, etc., though the common orthography conceals them in many cases. (5) The influence of doublet forms in dialects which generally drop final *-e*. The existence of pairs of interchangeable forms like *wolt: wolte* would easily produce uncertainty in regard to the use of final *-e*, and

might result in its appearance in places where it formerly did not occur. This is theoretically a plausible explanation, as many similar things have occurred; we need only think of the frequent assimilation of *-nd-* into *-nn-*, which resulted in the doublet forms of the present participle *gebende*: *gebenne*, which, reacting on the infinitive *ze gebenne*, produced the form *ze gebende*.

Bearing in mind how often a linguistic phenomenon is due to a combination of circumstances rather than to any one cause, Professor Rein wisely accepts no one of these explanations to the exclusion of the others. It would be strange indeed if the same circumstances which caused the earliest sporadic appearances of the epenthetical *-e* in the eleventh century, were also responsible for its rapid spread in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in spite of the great changes that had taken place in the language in the intervening centuries. In the oldest period, as soon as the vowels of the verbal endings had all been reduced to *e*, the first and third singular of the strong preterites, having no endings at all, must have appeared as abnormal forms, and a tendency to normalize them by giving them an *-e* in accordance with other forms of similar function must have made itself felt. The application of the principle was held in check, however, by the natural conservatism of the language, especially potent in the strong verbs owing to the frequent occurrence of many of them. Later, owing to the confusion caused by the divergence of the literary language from the native speech of many writers, especially in the South, the use of the *-e* greatly increased, until the standard language had become sufficiently normalized and had become sufficiently familiar in all parts of the country, when the forms with *-e* gradually vanished, with the exception of *wurde*, which has become definitely established. Professor Rein clearly and interestingly sets forth the details of these processes.

Only the mixed preterites of the type of *sahe* are discussed; no mention is made of two other interesting types. In late M. H. G. there are occasionally found forms of the second singular preterite of weak verbs, showing the usual *-t*, but the root-vowel and the ending of a strong verb; instead of the common *du brāhtest* we find *du brāhte* on the model of *du wāre*, e. g.,

du were mir unbekant

sit du die wilden wurme brehte her in dis lant.

Wolfdietrich 792.

The result is a wholly distorted perspective of Hazlitt, who, of all the group that set the pattern of the new essay, was the most modern, owed least to the older models, and had the greatest influence upon later writers. Finally, any presentation of Hazlitt as essayist that leaves wholly out of account his relationship to Montaigne and to Rousseau is at least inadequate.

It must be apparent that to the student of literary history who wishes accurate information upon the development of the essay as a type, Professor Walker's work can be of little service. But the reader who is concerned only with the single essayists and is little interested in origins and relations will find the volume very attractive. The appreciations of the individual essayists are evidently derived from Professor Walker's own interested though not always analytical reading of the essays themselves, and they have, accordingly, the merit of freshness and originality. The style is delightfully readable, and there is throughout a pleasing absence of any *ex cathedra* manner. The reader of essays will find in the volume much to revive the charm of what he has enjoyed, and he will be tempted to follow Professor Walker's example and browse widely in one of the most interesting fields of English literature.

W. F. BRYAN.

Northwestern University.

Mixed Preterites in German. By O. P. REIN, Ph. D., Assistant Professor in the University of North Carolina. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1915. [*Hesperia*: Schriften zur germanischen Philologie, no. 5.]

The lengthened forms of the strong preterites in German like *sahe, schuf* for *sah, schuf*, though familiar to every reader of older German literature, have until recently received scant attention from the grammarians, and only off-hand explanations of their origin, based on insufficient evidence, have been given. Professor Rein, in a recent volume of Collitz' valuable series *Hesperia*, presents the results of a scholarly and practically exhaustive study of these forms, and tries to account for their origin so far as the evidence will permit.

Leaving out of account the form *antfunda* of Heliand 2017,

which arose under peculiar circumstances, the oldest examples of strong preterites in *-e* are found in a fragment of a creed of the eleventh century: *das er geboren wart und gefangen wart, unt daz er irstarbe . . . daz er . . . ze himile fuore*. The occurrences up to the fourteenth century the author classifies as "exceptional instances"; but he has unearthed a considerable number of them, so many, in fact, that it seems strange that they have been so little noticed. It is true that there might be a difference of opinion as to the admissibility of some of the cases listed. It is, for instance, not clear why several occurrences of *zogete* are included, as M. H. G. *zogen*, O. H. G. *zogōn* must be regarded as a weak verb, quite distinct from *ziehen*. One of the difficulties with which the author naturally had to contend, was that of distinguishing between indicative and subjunctive. This, of course, is not always possible, but as the conjunction *ē* was in M. H. G. generally used with the subjunctive, it would seem to have been safer to regard strong preterites in *-e* after *ē* as subjunctives, unless the root-vowel clearly showed them to be indicatives. But there is included in the list from the *Speculum Ecclesiae*: *ē aber von sinen iungirn schiede, so getroste er si*; also *Parzival* 101.14 ff:

ahzeheniu maner durchstochen sach
und mit swerten zerhouwen,
ē er schiede von der frouwen,

and similar cases. Most of the cases cited, however, are incontrovertibly strong preterite indicative forms in *-e*, and they become more and more numerous in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, from which the author has carefully examined a vast mass of literature. During the sixteenth century the usage is common in all parts of Germany, but its height is reached in the seventeenth century. Stems ending in old *-h* show the greatest tendency to take the epenthetical *-e*, e. g. *sahe, flohe, geschahe*, and the grammarian Schottel apparently uses the *-e* only with such stems. But many other stems have the lengthened forms with more or less frequency, such as *kame, nahme, triebe, gabe, schriebe, hube, liefe, verlore, fuhre, fiele, zoge, floge, gienge, ware*, etc. During the eighteenth century the lengthened forms become less frequent, and toward the end of the century they disappear rapidly; Goethe uses them only in his early writings. After 1800 few such forms are found, and these are used chiefly by writers affecting an archaic style. The

two forms which survive longest are *sahe* and *wurde*. The former was still given in the much-respected dictionary of Adelung (1774 and 1793) and even in Campe's dictionary (1810) as the only form of the preterite of *sehen*, but it has since gone out of use; *wurde*, on the other hand, has survived and has largely driven out *ward*, though in consequence of a slight semantic difference which has sprung up between the two forms, they will probably continue side by side in higher diction.

In explanation of the origin of the lengthened forms several distinct influences have been suggested. (1) That of the weak verbs: *sahe* = *lobte*. This has been accepted by several grammarians as a sufficient explanation, and the imperatives of strong verbs in *-e* on the model of those of weak verbs have been cited as an analogous case: *siehe* = *lobe*. The strong verbs in *-t* have been mentioned as those from which this influence might more especially have proceeded: *borste*, *schalte* = *lobte*. On the basis of this explanation these forms may be called "mixed preterites." (2) The influence of the subjunctive. This could not have been strong in any case, as the subjunctive is used so much less than the indicative. (3) The influence of the present tense: *sahe* = *sehe*. This would at most apply to the first person, not to the third; but as far as Professor Rein's lists show, there is no evidence that the epenthetical *-e* was found first and more often in the first person; rather the contrary. In general, the present tense of strong verbs seems to have reacted little upon the preterite; for instance, forms like *gabt* for *gab* on the analogy of *gibt* are extremely rare. (4) In the verbs ending in a media, the desire to prevent the change to the tenuis if the media became final: *warde* for *wart*. As purpose is known to play a minimal part in the creation of linguistic forms, all that could possibly be claimed on this score is that of two existing forms *warde* and *wart* the former was preferred because it agreed with the present tense in the matter of the *d*. But it would not explain the genesis of *warde*, nor throw any light on the numerous *kame*, *verlore*, etc. Besides, German is full of sound-interchanges like *d:t*, *b:p*, etc., though the common orthography conceals them in many cases. (5) The influence of doublet forms in dialects which generally drop final *-e*. The existence of pairs of interchangeable forms like *wolt:wolte* would easily produce uncertainty in regard to the use of final *-e*, and

might result in its appearance in places where it formerly did not occur. This is theoretically a plausible explanation, as many similar things have occurred; we need only think of the frequent assimilation of *-nd-* into *-nn-*, which resulted in the doublet forms of the present participle *gebende: gebenne*, which, reacting on the infinitive *ze gebenne*, produced the form *ze gebende*.

Bearing in mind how often a linguistic phenomenon is due to a combination of circumstances rather than to any one cause, Professor Rein wisely accepts no one of these explanations to the exclusion of the others. It would be strange indeed if the same circumstances which caused the earliest sporadic appearances of the epenthetical *-e* in the eleventh century, were also responsible for its rapid spread in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in spite of the great changes that had taken place in the language in the intervening centuries. In the oldest period, as soon as the vowels of the verbal endings had all been reduced to *e*, the first and third singular of the strong preterites, having no endings at all, must have appeared as abnormal forms, and a tendency to normalize them by giving them an *-e* in accordance with other forms of similar function must have made itself felt. The application of the principle was held in check, however, by the natural conservatism of the language, especially potent in the strong verbs owing to the frequent occurrence of many of them. Later, owing to the confusion caused by the divergence of the literary language from the native speech of many writers, especially in the South, the use of the *-e* greatly increased, until the standard language had become sufficiently normalized and had become sufficiently familiar in all parts of the country, when the forms with *-e* gradually vanished, with the exception of *wurde*, which has become definitely established. Professor Rein clearly and interestingly sets forth the details of these processes.

Only the mixed preterites of the type of *sahe* are discussed; no mention is made of two other interesting types. In late M. H. G. there are occasionally found forms of the second singular preterite of weak verbs, showing the usual *-t*, but the root-vowel and the ending of a strong verb; instead of the common *du brähtest* we find *du brähte* on the model of *du wære*, e. g.,

du were mir unbekant
sit du die wilden wurme brehte her in dis lant.

Wolfdietrich 792.

On the other hand in Modern Alemannian and Bavarian preterite subjunctives of strong verbs in *-t* are of frequent occurrence. Gott-helf uses *ich kämt, nähmt, rüft*, etc.; Rosegger writes: *wans na koani weiba gabad* = *wenns nur keine weiber gäbe*.

H. C. G. VON JAGEMANN.

Harvard University.

Essai sur l'évolution des doctrines de M. Georges Sorel, par FREDERIC D. CHEYDLEUR. (Thèse présentée pour le doctorat.) Université de Grenoble, 1914.

In the *mouvement des idées* in France during the two pregnant decades preceding the war, Sorel was a salient and symptomatic, if not exactly a typical, figure; and, to those who do not deem it an impropriety that the historian of literature should deviate into the contemporaneous, a study of the interactions between so individual a mind and the intellectual forces at work during the period must seem an undertaking promising not a little of interest and illumination. This promise Mr. Cheydleur's volume fulfills not quite so generously as could be wished. It offers a series of faithful *précis* of certain writings of Sorel, chronologically arranged, and suitably grouped into "periods." The account given of the main outlines of Sorel's intellectual development is clear enough. But there is little analysis and cross-examination of the author's thought, and no sufficient collation of the scattered materials into a single connected exposition. Nowhere, for example, will the reader clearly or comprehensively gather what the elements in Bergson's philosophy were which Sorel made his own, and into what specific ideas of Sorel's they were transformed. Nor does the study quite cover the ground, even in its own way. After the *Réflexions sur la violence*, perhaps the most characteristic and noteworthy of Sorel's writings is *Les illusions du progrès*; for those who are chiefly interested in literary history it is the most significant of all. Of the contents of this volume Mr. Cheydleur gives no account. In spite of these limitations, however, his work is by no means without value for the student of the author or of the period.

In its actuating ideas Sorel's thought is one phase of that contemporary neo-romanticism which dislikes to acknowledge its ancestry. Fundamental in him are half a dozen of the 'notes' of the

Romantic: a taste for 'the infinite' as such—"all that is best in the modern mind," he writes, "comes from this torment of the infinite"; anti-intellectualism, a deep distrust of 'conceptual thought' and a faith in the obscurer faculties of the soul, in the subconscious, the unanalyzable, and the intuitive; consequent contempt for the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and all its works; apotheosis of the idea of 'creative' activity and genuine becoming; glorification of art, conceived as free creation and self-expression; and an indefatigable zeal in berating the *bourgeois*, the philistine, the average 'respectable' citizen. All this, of course, is familiar enough. What makes Sorel very curious and interesting is that in him, in his syndicalist period, we behold the Romanticist turned radical social reformer; that he derived from these Romantic ideas—immensely adaptable as history had already shown them to be—a new theory of revolutionary agitation and a new scheme for the reconstruction of society. The cardinal principles of this social philosophy are three. (a) The salvation of mankind cannot come through the *bourgeois intellectuels*, vulgarized and commercialized as they are, and with a superstitious faith in 'science' and in political machinery. It is to the workers, the makers, that we must look for "the birth of a virtue which the middle-class Intellectuals are incapable of understanding, a virtue which has the power to save civilization as Renan hoped it would be saved—but by the total elimination of the class to which Renan belonged." It must, therefore, be the paramount immediate concern of syndicalism to keep the working-class uncorrupted by *bourgeois* ideals and ambitions. Hence the necessity for "violence," chiefly in the form of frequent strikes, designed for the sole purpose of preventing any fusion or *rapprochement* of the two classes. (b) The end to be aimed at by the syndicalist revolution is the establishment of an order dominated, not by the ideal of justice in the distribution of material goods, but by the ideal of "production"—of production in the spirit of the artist or the inventor, who is concerned, not for reward or even for praise, but for the perfection of his work. This joy of disinterested creation must be made the daily possession of every worker, by means of an industrial organization adapted to that end. The essentials of the syndicalist millennium had, in fact, before Sorel, been exactly pictured in verse (doubtless a more appropriate medium) by so excellent a Tory Romanticist as Kipling; it is to be a time

When no one shall work for money and no one shall work for fame,
But all for the joy of working,

and each in his separate *atelier* shall make things as he sees that they ought to be made. (c) The syndicalist agitation must be given "nobility" and indestructible vitality by means of a "myth,"—i. e., by being inspired by the vision of a single crowning act of heroic militancy, in which all may conceive themselves as participating, an act which is "indivisible," like the Bergsonian intuition, and the anticipation of which evokes in the working-class mind all its most ardent memories. It is the "myth of the general strike" which thus functions in syndicalism. Just because such a myth is not a mere calculation of the intellect, it is no part of the syndicalist's affair to inquire whether a general strike is a really practicable enterprise—to apply a cold conceptual analysis to his vision. These principles are accompanied in Sorel by a trait of decidedly less Romantic affinities—an austere and almost rigoristic moral tone and an especial concern for the purification of sexual morality. There is much in him besides his bad temper that recalls an older preacher of the Gospel of Work, whose teaching also was much more than half a variation upon Romantic themes—Carlyle.

Most of all a typical Romanticist is Sorel in the final outcome (to date, at all events) of his intellectual history. Readers of Brandes's *Romantic School in Germany* will remember the page in which he calls the roll of nearly all the conspicuous members of that school, and records the final lapse of each into conservatism, and usually into the bosom of Mother Church. Traditionalism seems the end to which the Romantic anti-intellectualism all but inevitably brings a man, as he grows old; the shadowy recollections of his early pieties prove to be the variety of the "sub-conscious" and unrationalized which triumphs over all others at the last. And it is as a "retour au traditionalisme" that Mr. Cheydleur characterizes Sorel's latest phase. In his attitude towards Catholic Christianity that return was manifestly in process even while he was the semi-official philosopher of revolutionary syndicalism; in *Les illusions du progrès*, first published in *Le Mouvement Socialiste* in 1906, he already hoped for a revival of Catholicism "sous l'action d'hommes formés à la vie spirituelle dans les instituts monastiques." In consequence of this common religious sympathy, and of a common antipathy to all that is *bourgeois* and 'republican,' Sorel has of late, Mr. Cheydleur tells us, found himself swept in some degree

into coöperation with that influential royalist and nationalist movement represented by such writers as Charles Maurras, Leon Daudet, Jules Lemaitre, and Paul Bourget. Sorel's latest writings, being chiefly journalistic, are much less accessible than those of his earlier periods; and it is to be regretted that Mr. Cheydeur has not given us more full and precise details of this concluding phase of that "evolution of doctrines" which his book traces.

A. O. LOVEJOY.

Johns Hopkins University.

Seventeenth Century French Readings, edited with notes by ALBERT SCHINZ and HELEN MAXWELL KING. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1915. 12mo., xiv + 382 pp.

Professor Schinz and Miss King have stated in the Preface the object of their book: "This book aims at providing, for the study of the French literature of the seventeenth century, a greater variety of texts than are now easily accessible." The method followed may be summarized as follows: (1) To include fewer authors, and allow more material under each name, rather than to include all the notable authors of the period; (2) To omit Corneille, Racine and Molière; (3) To include all authors of great importance of whom there exist no easily accessible editions; (4) In selecting texts, "to emphasize strongly that these are not *our* selections; . . . they are simply those sanctioned by a sort of tacit vote cast by the intellectual élite of past generations"; (5) To give "few notes—historical mainly—and with such preliminary comments only as are necessary to direct the student's thoughts along the proper lines"; (6) In arranging material, to disregard the chronological order, and to adopt the following arbitrary one: "L'École de Malherbe et les épigones du XVI^e siècle"; Ch. 1, L'Hôtel de Rambouillet; Ch. 2, L'Académie Française; Ch. 3, Boileau; Ch. 4, Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes; Ch. 5, La Fontaine; Ch. 6, Descartes; Ch. 7, Pascal; Ch. 8, Bossuet; Ch. 9, Fénelon; Ch. 10, Les Moralistes; Ch. 11, Trois Femmes Écrivains; (7) "To give only complete passages, but in some cases we have deemed it necessary to forego our own rule."

There can be no question of the editors' statement: "That [the seventeenth] century is indisputably the fundamental age of French

literature." Consequently their aim to provide "a greater variety of texts than are now easily accessible" is praiseworthy. There is room for another collection alongside of Warren's text-book, from which the present work differs in two respects: in giving many more authors, and in including verse as well as prose. In determining how well the editors have carried out their task, we may consider in order the points of their preface.

(1) The editors' decision "to include fewer authors, and allow more under each name," is too obviously wise to require any argument. One may ask, however, if it would not have been desirable to extend this principle by excluding a few of the writers now included, *e. g.*, Mme de Maintenon and some of the extremely minor authors of Ch. 1. (2) Equally wise was the decision to omit the dramatists—these texts are already abundantly provided and do not easily lend themselves to abridgment. (3) The editors may fairly claim to have "included all authors of *great* [italics mine] importance of whom there exist no easily accessible editions." But some of those omitted are at least as important as some of those included. The most noteworthy omissions are in the fields of memoirs and the novel. Even if "Retz . . . required too much historical knowledge of the times to be made enjoyable," Saint-Simon (not even mentioned) should by all means have been represented, for few authors of the period are more interesting to the student. The intelligent and witty Saint-Évremond, also ignored, ought certainly to be included under some heading.—Parenthetically, the important *libertin* current of thought, of which Saint-Évremond is one representative, is entirely neglected save in perhaps two lines from Théophile de Viau.—The novel is represented only by passages from the rather pallid *Princesse de Clèves* and the tiresome *Télémaque*. Selections from the *Astrée* or *Cyrus* might well have supplemented the scanty representation of the pastoral contained in the verse selections. If space allowed, passages from *Le page disgracié* or *Le roman bourgeois* would have proved interesting.—But the editor of every such collection has to steer between the Scylla of neglecting some authors and the Charybdis of producing a "scrappy" book. On the whole, our editors are to be congratulated on their choice of authors, and especially on the inclusion of certain minor writers, such as Régnier, Théophile, Vaugelas and Perrault, really essential if one would comprehend the development of the literature of the century. (4) While the editor

—and the reviewer—of an anthology must of course be largely guided in the choice of texts by the consensus of critical opinion of the past, it does not necessarily follow that one should abdicate all right to critical judgment himself. At the risk of running counter to Boileau and the “intellectual élite of past generations,” the reviewer will point out some instances in which it seems to him that the selections might have been better. Some regrettable omissions have been already noted. On the other hand, Mme de Maintenon, some of the *précieux* (abundantly represented in Crane’s *Société française au XVII^e siècle*), part of La Fontaine (“easily accessible” in several American editions), and Boileau’s *Passage du Rhin* might well go by the board. So too some of *Télémaque*, if its place were taken by parts of the interesting *Lettre à l’Académie*. In the apportionment of space, always a delicate point, there are some observations to make. The Hôtel de Rambouillet and the *précieux* are given over one-eighth of the text. Boileau has 34 pages, more than La Rochefoucauld and La Bruyère combined. Pascal has fewer pages than Descartes, though his literary value is far greater. Perault has more than twice as many pages as La Rochefoucauld, who is probably the least adequately represented of the really important authors. He is allowed but 9 pages, and more than one-third of these are the relatively unimportant *Portrait* of himself. Even Mme de Maintenon is given much more space than he! It is difficult to see what principle guided the editors in this important point. (5) The paucity of notes and critical interpretation, while avowedly intentional, strikes the present reviewer as the most serious defect of the book. The notes are too scanty, and not a few are inaccurate. Moreover, they are unwisely put in French. Why the notes, meant to help the student, should be in French, while the Preface, meant to help teachers, should be in English, is indeed a puzzle. Among the inaccuracies in the notes are the following. P. 25, n. 1; Mme de Rambouillet was only half “Italienne.” Pp. 44 and 98; the editors accept “Somaize” without question; cf. J. Warshaw, “The Identity of Somaize,” in *M. L. N.*, Feb. and March, 1914. P. 47, fine print, l. 11; the date “1909” in connection with V. Cousin is misleading. P. 67, fine print; the “sonnet de Benserade” is a sonnet by courtesy only. P. 71, n. 3; “électeurs” were not “dignitaires diplomatiques.” P. 82, n. 2; Barbin’s shop was not “en face du Palais de Justice,” but in it. P. 99, n. 2; “Quinault, auteur de dix-sept tragédies, attaquées vio-

lemment par le critique Zoïle." What is meant by this note must be left to the imagination of the reader. P. 133, n. 1; According to Larousse, barracks in France date from the 16th century, and their use became general under Louis XIV. P. 142, n. 1; The explanation of the expression: "il ferait que sage" is not "Il ferait ce qui serait sage" but rather "Il ferait ce que ferait un sage." Cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, I, pp. 11-12. P. 238, fine print, l. 2; Charles I was not "condamné à mort par Cromwell," nor (*ib.*, l. 9) was Henriette d'Angleterre "extrêmement belle." P. 314, n. 2; La Bruyère passed only the last twelve years of his life, not "la plus grande partie," at Chantilly. P. 319, n. 1; The "honnête homme" of the seventeenth century can not be well defined in a few words; but "honnête" commonly connoted moral qualities or social polish rather than "culture intellectuelle." P. 320, n. 1; It is not accurate to say that Henri IV "devint roi de France en renonçant au protestantisme." P. 326, n. 1; The note entirely misses the point of La Bruyère's epigram, which is directed rather against adults than against children. P. 328, n. 1; The last part of the note is worse than useless. Think of citing *La tulipe noire* as "littérature" in connection with La Bruyère! P. 370, n. 2; This should have been given under n. 2 on p. 365. P. 92, l. 15; It should be explained that "Tholus" (Dutch "Toll-Huys," *i. e.*, "toll-house"), magnified by contemporary adulators of Louis XIV into a fortress, was really only a slightly fortified custom-house. P. 274, n. 2; The student should be told who "M. de Condom" was.—Notes on the numerous terms of mythology—Atropos, Acheron, etc.—ought not to be necessary, but unfortunately are today.

With the above exceptions, the notes are in general satisfactory. The notes on the language should be far more numerous, the more so as the book, very properly, has no vocabulary. The editors would have done well to bear in mind what M. Lanson has said of seventeenth century French: "les mots qu'on entend du premier coup, qui sont familiers à première vue, ont eu souvent des sens et des emplois qui diffèrent de leurs sens et de leurs emplois actuels par des nuances fines et presque imperceptibles." (*Conseils sur l'art d'écrire*, p. 245). These *nuances* constitute many pitfalls for the student and even for the teacher; obsolete words also cause trouble.¹

¹ Among the places where the student will find no help in the notes, are the following. P. 12, l. 9, pour ce que. P. 14, l. 21, impiteux. P. 16, l. 10,

In the matter of literary criticism, the editors throw almost the entire burden upon the teacher. They give no bibliography; they even advise (p. iv, n. 1) against the use of French histories of literature. This book will be used by college students in their second or third year, when they should be mature enough to begin to utilize the excellent French manuals. Histories of French literature in English, especially Wright's *History of French Literature*, might also have well been mentioned. The editors profess to give only "such preliminary comments as are necessary to direct the student's thoughts along the proper lines." (P. iv). Even here they are not consistent. Generally there is not a word of comment. Sometimes—for instance, on Pascal—there is critical comment that is good as far as it goes. But the prefatory note on the *Pensées* does not even mention the prophecies or the fall of man, the two corner-stones of the work. Space that might be devoted to criticism is given up to unimportant gossip or "portraits," as for Mme de La Fayette and Mme de Sévigné. The critical apparatus is as a whole haphazard and jejune. The book would have been far more valuable if a pithy critique were prefixed to the selections from each author, and a brief bibliography appended. (6) In arranging their material, the editors have disregarded the simplest and most natural order, the chronological (which they say "means chaos"). It is open to question whether the plan

ressentiments. P. 46, l. 16, alcôves. P. 62, l. 23, vingt-six fois (modern "trente-six"). P. 64, l. 24, parterment. P. 153, l. 11, aussi (non plus). P. 154, l. 1, hier. P. 193, l. 20, prudence (sagesse). P. 211, l. 7, s'en tirer (s'en arracher). P. 217, l. 21, morale positive. (Cf. théologie positive). P. 225, l. 21, chats fourrés. P. 225, l. 27, authentique (imposante, solennelle). P. 235, l. 25, comédie. P. 244, l. 16, Madame. P. 314, l. 18, coquins (mendiants). P. 319, l. 9, imagination (fantaisie). P. 324, l. 20, prévenu. P. 360, l. 16, médiocrité. P. 360, l. 23, rendue (convaincue). P. 371, l. 12, petite (faible). P. 371, l. 22, Sagesse. In a few cases, the explanations are not correct. P. 27, n. 2, plancher is not restricted entirely to the meaning "floor" today; cf. "sauter au plancher." P. 77, n. 1, Si = "pour-tant," not "ainsi." P. 88, n. 2, Fiction does not = "imagination." P. 143, n. 1, hoquet = "choc," not "obstacle." In a good many cases, necessary notes on constructions or forms are missing. P. 19, l. 3, dessus (prep.). P. 19, l. 17, eut sa vie expirée. P. 25, l. 14, devant (avant). P. 25, l. 16, une fois autant de (deux fois plus de). P. 27, l. 9, Luxembourg (le L.). P. 43, l. 17, devant que (avant que). P. 96, l. 1, à vous à qui. P. 171, l. 17, s'étaient pu glisser. P. 233, l. 25, ôte de blâme. P. 310, l. 6, moins (le moins). P. 313, l. 24, vale (vaille). P. 318, l. 4, soi (lui).

followed is any less chaotic. The "Révoltés contre Malherbe" precede the "Disciples de Malherbe." The selections from Boileau are given under two headings. The "Querelle des anciens et des modernes," an affair of the end of the century, is put in an early chapter. Descartes, who for every reason should be in one of the first chapters, is found only in Ch. VI, after La Fontaine, who is distinctly an author of the second half of the century. For no conceivable reason, La Bruyère precedes La Rochefoucauld, and Fénelon both of them. (7) The editors' principle of giving only complete passages, but of foregoing this rule when necessary, is undoubtedly the method most likely to avoid scrappiness on the one hand and tedium on the other. Opinions will differ as to what should be omitted. Thus, in Malherbe's *Consolation à M. du Périer*, the omission of some of the lines full of mythological allusions seems to the present reviewer good judgment, the omission of the stanza beginning "Non qu'il ne me soit grief," bad judgment. More of Régnier's admirable *Satire IX* would have been welcome. Boileau's *Art poétique* is cut too much, some of the most important passages being omitted, e.g. Chant III, ll. 1-8, 93-102, 359-372, 391-428. Descartes' *Discours* is in general well abridged, but at least two very important passages are omitted, one in the II^e Partie, beginning "pour toutes les opinions que j'avais reçues," one in the III^e Partie, beginning "notre volonté ne se portant." Some of the finest of Pascal's *Pensées* are not given, e.g. end of Art. I, 1; Art. IV, 7; Art. VI, 50; Art. VII, 9; the last part of Art. IX, 1; Art. XXII, 3; *ib.*, 58; Art. XXV, 17 *bis*. In the case of anything so logically planned as Bossuet's funeral orations, it would probably have been preferable to give one oration entire rather than parts of two. All things considered, however, the editors have handled well this difficult and delicate task of excision.

The book seems to have comparatively few misprints.²

² The following are the only important ones noted. P. 9, l. 9; comma missing at end. P. 44, l. 13; *gue*, read *que*. P. 82, l. 20 either the comma after *toujours* or all three commas were better omitted. Cf. note in Brunetière's edition, Hachette. The editors nowhere state what texts they follow. P. 258, fine print, l. 7; *Philippe V*, read *Philippe IV*. P. 259, fine print, l. 11; *Philippe VI*, read *Philippe IV*. P. 284, fine print, l. 10; *ses fastes*, read *son faste*. P. 315, l. 20; *annobli*; read *anobli* or *ennobli*. (La Bruyère wrote *annobli*, but as the editors have wisely modernized the spelling elsewhere, *annobli* should be changed). P. 334, l. 1; *frissés*; read *frisés*. P. 356, title and fine print, l. 1; *Demoiselle*; read *Mademoiselle*.

From the comments above, it is evident that the book under review falls short of perfection in some important points. It is to be regretted that Professor Schinz has not thought it worth while to devote the undoubted resources of his scholarship to producing a book that should be thoroughly good, instead of merely good. But whatever its sins of omission, the "Seventeenth Century French Readings" makes available for class use a lot of excellent material. It deserves to be widely introduced in colleges and doubtless will be.

GEORGE N. HENNING.

George Washington University.

CORRESPONDENCE

A SENTENCE FROM AN ENGLISH NOTEBOOK OF VOLTAIRE'S

In the *English Review*, February, 1914, there appeared under the title, "An English Notebook of Voltaire," several pages of hitherto unpublished notes which Voltaire evidently jotted down, in part at least, during the early months of his stay in England, in 1726.¹ These notes were discovered in Petrograd and published by Fernand Caussy, a scholar well known for his interest in Voltaire, although without his name and with almost no comment. They contain material which is of interest in various connections. The English is curious but for the most part intelligible.

One entry, in particular, is significant in that it seems to touch upon a point in Voltaire's biography of which almost nothing is known and which has been considerably discussed. The sentence in question reads: "Thirty and one of july one thousand seven hundred twenty and six, I saw floating islands nyer(near) Saint Om . . ." ² There can be little doubt that Saint Om . . . is Saint Omer, a town in northern France, the capital of the department of Pas-de-Calais, northwest of Lille and on the road to Calais. The town lies on the river Aa. From that point on, the river is canalized. Haut Pont, an outlying district of Saint Omer, is inhabited by people of Flemish origin who preserve the Flemish language and curious old customs. The ground cultivated by these people

¹ *English Review*, 1914, pp. 313 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 315.

is reclaimed marshland "and the *lègres* (i. e. the square blocks of land) communicate with each other only by boats floated on the ditches and canals that divide them."³ This fact would account for the allusion to "floating islands." Granting that Voltaire was in Saint Omer July 31, 1726, we have here an interesting contribution to our very scant knowledge regarding a secret trip he made to Paris during the first summer of his stay in England. In a letter to his friend Thiériot, dated August 12 and early included in the correspondence of Voltaire, he refers to this journey: "Je vous avouerai donc, mon cher Thiériot, que j'ai fait un petit voyage à Paris, depuis peu. Puisque je ne vous y ai point vu, vous jugerez aisément que je n'ai vu personne. Je ne cherchais qu'un seul homme, que l'instinct de sa poltronnerie a caché de moi, comme s'il avait deviné que je fusse à sa piste. Enfin la crainte d'être découvert m'a fait partir plus précipitamment que je n'étais venu."⁴

It will be remembered that Voltaire had been imprisoned in the Bastille in April, 1726, to prevent his meeting a nobleman with whom he had quarreled, that he had been released May 3, on condition that he should remain at least fifty leagues distant from Paris, and that he had chosen England as the place of his exile. The brief trip to Paris of which he speaks would therefore of necessity be a secret one. It is probable that, in undertaking it, he hoped to meet his enemy and avenge his honor; it is possible, too, that he wished to look after certain financial interests in Paris.⁵

Beyond the information contained in the letter quoted—open to question because of Voltaire's well known disregard for accuracy and his natural desire to appear to have made every effort to avenge his honor—nothing definite was known regarding this incident until the publication in 1892 and again in 1905 of several pages of an important English letter of Voltaire's which has finally been dated October 15, o. s., 1726.⁶ In this letter, evidently addressed to Thiériot, occurs the sentence: "I (went) came again into England in the latter end of July very much dissatisfied with my secret voiage into France both unsuccessful and expensive."⁷ Commenting on this letter, and on this sentence in particular,

³ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1911, *St. Omer*.

⁴ Foulet, *Correspondance de Voltaire*, 1913, pp. 43-44.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 44, n. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. xxxv-xliv and p. 53.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55.

Lanson said: "Elle met hors de doute le voyage secret que fit Voltaire en France au milieu de 1726, et confirme la lettre du 12 août 1726."⁸ In the *Revue d'histoire littéraire*, 1908, Foulet pointed out that a careful examination of the letter of August 12, usually considered by editors of Voltaire's correspondence to have been sent from England, shows that it was in all probability written in Calais. Seeking to reconcile Voltaire's statement that he "came again into England in the latter end of July" with the fact that this letter, dated August 12, was undoubtedly written in France, Foulet said: "Il est probable que, dans sa lettre anglaise à Thiériot, Voltaire, comme cela lui arrive de temps en temps, date d'après le calendrier anglais: dans le nouveau style le 31 juillet (a. s.) nous mettrait au 11 août . . . Ecrivant deux mois après, Voltaire a pu se tromper de deux ou trois jours sur la date de son retour en Angleterre."⁹

The entry in Voltaire's notebook, quoted above, accords with these conclusions. It appears that July 31 Voltaire was in Saint Omer on his way to Calais and that the following day, August 1, o. s., August 12, n. s., he wrote from Calais the letter to Thiériot from which we have quoted, in the course of which he was still debating as to whether he should again make the journey to London. Very soon after, he decided to do so and left France about the 13th or 14th of August, n. s., the 2nd or 3rd, o. s., according to Foulet's conjectures.¹⁰ Writing to Thiériot some two months later, October 26, n. s., October 15, o. s., it is natural that Voltaire, never regardless of accuracy, should have made a mistake of a day or two, stating that he had returned to England at the end of July instead of at the beginning of August. Here he was using, as in the entry in his notebook, the old style of reckoning.

It is, perhaps, worth while to quote the sentence in the notebook which immediately follows the one we have discussed: "In june of the present yar, Mylord Duc was turn'd out, force dead, in july."¹¹ The reference is to the Duke of Bourbon, Prime Minister of Louis XV since 1723, and suggests also, placed as it is, recent contact with affairs in Paris.

Vassar College.

FLORENCE DONNELL WHITE.

⁸ *Revue d'histoire littéraire*, 1905, p. 719.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 1908, p. 123.

¹⁰ Foulet, *Correspondance de Voltaire*, p. 45, n. 2.

¹¹ *English Review*, 1914, p. 315.

SPENSER, SIDNEY, AND THE AREOPAGUS

Dr. Percy W. Long's article in *Anglia* (xxxviii, 173 f.) on "Spenser and Sidney" seems to be a case of excessive zeal in the uprooting of literary heresies. It may be well enough to push home the attack on the Areopagus made by Dr. Maynadier¹ a few years ago, but to assert roundly that "Spenser's acquaintance with Sidney, so far as evidence establishes it, never passed greatly beyond Johnson's early overtures to Chesterfield," would appear to be going a bit too far. Evidence as to the existence of the Areopagus is, of course, lamentably weak. Setting aside Spenser's remark to Harvey that Sidney and Dyer had "proclaimed in their ἀρειωπάγω a generall surceasing and silence of balde Rymers," we have no mention of such a club until quite recent times. Dr. Maynadier finds the first hint of it in Child's "Memoir of Spenser" (1855); but Child's words scarcely suggest a definitely organized club. Fox Bourne's *Memoir of Sir Philip Sidney*, which appeared in 1862, seems to have been chiefly responsible for the rise of the Areopagus legend. Fox Bourne specifically mentions the Areopagus, and calls it "a sort of club," of which "Sidney appears to have been . . . president" (p. 237). Upon this account of the Areopagus, apparently, are based all subsequent accounts. Considering that all our knowledge of the so-called Areopagus rests finally upon a remark which Spenser more than probably meant to be taken as a jest, we had better, perhaps, as Dr. Long suggests, stop talking about the Areopagus as an historic fact.

To give up the Areopagus, however, is by no means to admit that Spenser and Sidney were probably nothing more than mere acquaintances with few or no literary aims in common. The evidence is quite clear that both Spenser and Sidney were at one time taken with the idea of reforming English verse, and, from what Spenser says, apparently had in mind concerted action looking toward a propagandist movement in favor of it. Spenser is, doubtless, jesting when he tells Harvey that Sidney and Dyer have proclaimed a general silencing of "balde Rymers"; but his anxiety as to the necessity of the reformers coming to an agreement on the rules they should follow in their experiments shows that, for the

¹ Cf. *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, iv, 293.

time being, he took the matter quite seriously. "I would hartily wish," he writes to Harvey, "you would either send me the Rules and Precepts of Arte, which you observe in Quantities, or else followe mine, that M. Philip Sidney gave me, being the very same which M. Drant devised, but enlarged with M. Sidneys own judgement, and augmented with my Observations, that we might accorde and agree in one: leaste we overthrowe one an other, and be overthrown of the rest." Whether the reformers had any meetings for the discussion of the question, is not now known. We have Giordano Bruno's testimony, however, to the fact that Sidney, Dyer, and others met in 1584 in the house of Sir Fulke Greville "to discuss moral, metaphysical, mathematical, and natural speculations."² Earlier meetings to discuss the absorbing topic of "reformed" English verse are, therefore, probable enough.

As to the degree of friendship subsisting between Spenser and Sidney, we must, I think, unless we seriously impugn Spenser's reputation for truthfulness, accept it as a fact that the two men were on fairly intimate terms with each other before Spenser went to Ireland. What other meaning can we attach to Spenser's remark to Harvey that Sidney (and Dyer) had him "in some use of familiarity?" The fact that Spenser in 1579 dedicated his *Shepherd's Calendar* to Sidney, rather than to Leicester, in whose service he then was, lends color to the belief that a friendship had already sprung up between the two men. Dr. Long's suggestion that this dedication may have been a mere venture on Spenser's part, a thrusting of himself on Sidney's attention without his permission, may be met in Spenser's own words. In one of his letters to Harvey he writes: "Newe Bookes I heare of none, but only one, that writing a certaine Booke, called *The Schoole of Abuse*, and dedicating it to Maister Sidney, was for his labor scorned: if at leaste it be in the goodnesse of that nature to scorne. *Such follie is it, not to regarde aforehande the inclination and qualitie of him to whome we dedicate oure Bookes.*" Are we to suppose that Spenser himself would be likely to do what, almost in the same breath, he ridicules Gosson for doing? Dr. Long's contention that nowhere outside of the Harvey letters does Spenser definitely imply that he held converse with Sidney can scarcely be granted. The dedicatory preface to *The Ruines of Time*, which was addressed to Sidney's

² Fox Bourne, *Sir Philip Sidney*, N. Y., 1901, p. 292.

sister, very clearly implies such converse. He takes occasion, in reply to some friends who had upbraided him for allowing Sidney's name "to sleep in silence and forgetfulness" (Sidney had then been dead some four or five years), to emphasize his "entire love and humble affection unto that most brave knight,"—the seeds of which affection, he says, "taking roote, began in his life time some what to bud forth, and to shew themselves to him, as then in the weakenes of their first spring; and would in their riper strength (had it pleased high God till then to drawe out his daies) have spired forth fruit of more perfection." In the envoy, again, he reasserts his love for his friend:

Immortall spirite of Philisides,
Which now art made the heavens ornament,
That whilome wast the worldes chiefst riches,
Give leave to him that lov'de thee to lament
His losse.

Is it likely that Spenser would have expressed himself thus had his affection for Sidney not been real? And, granting that it was real, is there any likelihood that it would ever have come into being if Spenser had never had any opportunity for familiar converse with Sidney? The fact that Spenser waited some four or five years after Sidney's death before publishing any poetical lament for him proves nothing as to the character of his affection. It may be that he had good and sufficient reasons for not publishing before he did.

EDWARD FULTON.

University of Illinois.

NOTES ON THE ANGLO-SAXON *Andreas*

125-8. From the clumsiness of these lines as they stand in the manuscript several editors have found refuge in a parenthesis. The general sense of the passage is clear enough. The syntax would be simplified and the punctuation made somewhat more obvious by transposing lines 127, 128:

Duguð samnade,
hæðne hildfreca hēapum þrunon,
bolgenmōde, under bordhrēoðan;
gūðsearo gullon, gāras hrysedon.

For the intransitive use of *hrysedon*, cf. Laŕamon 15946, *þe eorðe gon to rusien* = *þe eorþe gan to cwakie* of the later text; 18868 *beornes scullen rusien*; and 26917 *riseden burnen*.

301 Næbbe ic fæted gold nē feohgestrēon,
 welan nē wiste nē wīra gespann,
 landes nē locenra bēaga.

For the dependence of the genitives *landes nē locenra bēaga* on an implied noun cf. *Judith* 158, 330:

 þæt ēow is wuldorblæd
torhtlic tōweard and tīr gifeðe
þāra lēðða¹ þe gē lange drugon;
 wægon and læddon
tō ðære beorhtan byrig Bethuliam
helmas and hupseax, hāre byrnan,
gūðsceorp gumena golde gefrætewod,
mærra mādma þonne mon ænig
asecgan mæge.

Although Shipley (*The Genitive Case in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 48) has noted and translated the passage in *Andreas*, he has not, so far as I can discover, made any comment on the two passages in *Judith*.

807-9. These lines recent editors print without punctuation. It seems better, however, to put a comma after *ēadwelan*, a verb of motion being supplied with *hēt*. Other examples are cited in Bosworth-Toller. Then *sēcan* is parallel with the verb supplied. Root's translation shows the construction: 'bade them forthwith return to blessedness, to seek a second time,' etc.

846. Wülker's facsimile shows the reading of the manuscript to be *þām*, the mark over *a* in *þā* being short and almost horizontal, quite unlike the longer slanting mark sometimes used to denote length. Perhaps the scribe made the wrong kind of mark. The reading *þā* seems preferable.

1124-5. In these and the following lines Krapp finds a striking grotesqueness: "an army is called together with all the accompaniments of battle for the purpose of devouring their single victim." Is 'army' quite the word here? Is not this interpretation too formal? Although *here samnodan* may be a technical military expression and although military phraseology, suggestions of warfare and

¹ Imelmann, *Beiblatt*, XIX, 7, translates, 'Euch ist ruhm verliehen für die leiden, die ihr lange ertragen.'

battle, may abound throughout the poem (see Krapp's summary and references, p. lii), I prefer a simpler interpretation which largely does away with the grotesqueness.

Now *here* and *folc* are more or less interchangeable. In *Maldon* 22 and 45 *folc* means 'army'; in the *Paris Psalter* lxxviii, 10, *þý lās āfre cweðan oðre þēoda hāðene herigeas* translates *nequando dicant in gentibus*; in *Andreas* 652 and *Menologium* 5 *side herigeas* = *folc unmaete*; and in *Andreas* 1198 *þissum herige* refers to *folc* of 1196. In 1123 therefore *here* = *folc*, with the connotation (common of course from the use of *here* in the *Chronicle*) of horde or rabble bent on destruction and slaughter. If then we translate, 'the heathen priests gathered together a mob of citizens,' and remember that a mob is likely to shout, to be armed, and to demand a victim, we may find no incongruity in the passage.

It is possible, though perhaps far-fetched, that *for herige* in l. 1127 means not 'before the crowd or host,' as the phrase is usually taken, but 'before the temple or altar' (dat. sg. of *hearh*), the temple being not specifically mentioned but implied in *herigweardas* 1124.

1358-9. Root translates, 'have words ready devised against that wicked wretch'; Hall, 'make ready now with well-chosen words for the wicked impostor.' But 'words' here is too colorless. Though a speech follows, *habbað word gearu* means more than 'be prepared to say something'; it rather implies take 'special precautions' against the superior power implied in *āglāca*, which Krapp here defines as 'magician.' We may, then, translate, 'have a spell or charm ready against the wizard.'

Something of the same idea may be present in *wordum* 1053.

1460. I suggest that *cræfta gehygd*, 'thought of crafts,' means 'crafty thoughts.' The phrase resembles *wuldres þrēat*, 870, 'throng of glory' = 'glorious throng,' and Hamlet's 'thieves of mercy' = 'merciful thieves' (iv, 6, 19). The reference seems to be to the craft implied in *āglāca* 1359.

1605-6. *Gumcystum* must be dat. pl. of *gumcyst*, a noun; yet the sense seems to require an adjective: 'there is now great need that we earnestly listen to (heed) the excellent man.' Accordingly I propose to read *gumcystgum*, dat. pl. of *gumcystig*. In the same way Krapp, following his note in *Modern Philology*, II, 404, changes *synne* 109 to *synnige*, explaining that "The ms. has regu-

larly the unsyncopated forms of this word; the form *synne* perhaps looks back to a time when the syncopated forms were still written." The remark may be applied to *gumcystum* as a syncopated form of *gumcystgum* or *gumcystigum*.

B. S. MONROE.

Cornell University.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *Gorboduc*

Dangerous as it is to decide matters of literary authorship on internal evidence, it may at times be tried, especially if the period be one where literary language, not being the possession of the many, was more likely to bear the imprint of the few.

The argument of those critics who refuse to admit the joint authorship of Norton and Sackville is weak enough, in fact it is hardly more than a negation against contemporary evidence unimpeached at the time. Basing their claim, just as Warton did, on "the force of internal evidence," none of his followers could fairly challenge the methods by which F. Koch, Miss Toulmin Smith, and Mr. H. A. Watt have tried (the men with more zeal than the woman) to support the printer's assertion (see *Gorboduc; or Ferrex and Porrex*, by H. A. Watt, Madison, Wisconsin, 1910, Chapter v and bibliography).

It may be that a minuter examination than has thus far been made would bring to light more internal evidence in favor of a, if not of the joint authorship.

Whilst re-reading the play a short time ago, some peculiarities struck me, which at first had entirely escaped my attention. The chief one is certain *tripartition* in the sense and in the sound of a number of lines. It is surprising that, so far as I know, attention should not yet have been called to this point. In a drama which Sidney praised for "clyming to the height of Seneca his stile" it would seem natural to look for traces of the well-known rhetorical *trikolon*.¹ I shall only quote the most convincing lines. (The quotations are from J. W. Cunliffe's *Early English Classical Tragedies*, Oxford, 1912).

- I, 1. Murders, / mischiefe, / or ciuill sword at length (62)
- I, 2. To me / and myne, / and to your natie lande (28)
- For you, / for yours, / and for our natie lande (40)
- Whose honours, / goods / and lynes are all auowed
- To serue, / to ayde, / and to defende your grace (44-45)
- For kinges, / for kingdomes, / and for common weales (48)
- And thinke it good for me, / for them, / for you (70)

¹ Cf. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, I, 289 ff.).

Their rule, / their virtues, / and their noble deedes (96)
 Your eye, / your counsell, / and the grave regarde (110)
 I thinke not good for you, / nor them, / for us (160)
 Ne kinde, / ne reason, / ne good ordre beares (204)
 This fire shall waste their loue, / their liues, / their land
 (295)

II, 1. In flowing wealth, / in honour / and in force (42)
 Is armed with force / with wealth, / and kingly state (63)
 Their landes, / their liues / and honours in your cause (113)
 Amid your frendes, / your vassalles / and your strength (136)
 Your fathers death, / your brothers / and your owne (166)
 The prince, / the people, / the diuided land (213)

II, 2. Of horse, / of armour, / and of weapon there (7)
 III, 1. This flame will wast your sonnes, / your land, / & you (41)
 The reuerence of your honour, / age, / and state (46)
 While yet your lyfe, / your wisdome, / and your power (115)

Chorus III. The dead black streames of mourning, / plaints / & woe (21)

Examining the last two acts, in all fairness I can find only two, or maybe three, lines as distinctly tripartite as those quoted above:

Ruthelesse, / vnkinde, / monster of natures worke (IV, 1, 71)
 To ruine of the realme, / them selues / and all (IV, 2, 63)
 These ciuil warres, / these murders / & these wrongs (V, 2, 275)

This gives three lines against twenty-two, although the last two acts are longer than the average.

Again internal evidence would seem to show a difference between the first three and the last two acts. Again the test would fail to reveal in the last part peculiarities not found in the other published work of their assumed author, there being no strikingly tripartite lines in Sackville's contributions to the *Mirroure for Magistrates*.

JOS. E. GILLET.

University of Illinois.

COLLINS AND THOMSON—A SUGGESTION

In view of the friendship between Collins and Thomson, the following passages, by way of comparison, are interesting and suggestive. The first, from the *Popular Superstitions*, relates to a "luckless swain" who was led to his death "in the dank, dark fen" by Will-O'-The-Wisp (Stanza VIII, 121-125):

For him, in vain, his anxious wife shall wait,
 Or wander forth to meet him on his way;
 For him, in vain, at to-fall of the day,
 His babes shall linger at th' enclosing gate.
 Ah, ne'er shall he return.

The second, from *Winter*, relates to a "swain disastered" who meets his death in a snowstorm (311-317):

In vain for him the officious wife prepares
 The fire fair-blazing, and the vestment warm;

In vain his little children, peeping out
 Into the mingling storm, demand their sire,
 With tears of artless innocence. Alas!
 Nor wife nor children more shall he behold,
 Nor friends, nor sacred home.

And some of the details in connection with the death of the swains have, apparently, more than an accidental similarity.

University of Montana.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN.

BRIEF MENTION

Common Conditions, edited by Tucker Brooke, from the copy in the Library of the Elizabethan Club of Yale University, compared with the Chatsworth copy now owned by Henry E. Huntington, Esq. (Elizabethan Club Reprints, No. 1, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915). An unusual degree of interest will be evoked by this edition of a play that has hitherto been known only according to a copy that lacked both the beginning and the end. It can now be seen how much has been wanting, and the critics that have exercised their ingenuity in conjecturing how the play ended will not all have the satisfaction of a verified guess. But these students of the play have something in their favor left in the cryptic and inconclusive character of the conclusion of the play, for even the complete text does not indisputably settle the question whether the ending is happy or unhappy. Nor does the recovered prolog resolve the ambiguity. The characteristic eloquence of the title-page is more to the point, for it declares the play to be "drawne out of the most famous historie of *Galiarbus* Duke of *Arabia*," and Mr. Brooke surmises (p. xiv) that perhaps "the play's termination was condoned in the eyes of a contemporary audience by the familiarity of its avowed source." However that may be, the once "most famous historie" is now most completely unknown, not a trace of it having yet been identified.

The play was licensed to be printed in 1576, and only two copies ("of two quite separate editions"), so far as is known, have "struggled through the centuries" to the present day. The play has been subjected to inaccuracies of name and date in its career thru the play-lists. The two surviving copies differ widely in their history. One has remained complete, but inaccessible; the other has lost by the way-side "nearly thirty per cent. of its original contents," but in its incompleteness has for some time been 'known and read.' By a curious turn of Fortune's wheel, as surprising as a turn in the play, both copies have found their home in America. The incomplete copy has been known since the latter part of the eighteenth century, when Malone made a transcript of it (Bodl.

Lib. MS. Malone 32). After having passed thru several sales (1787, 1800, 1812), it was purchased in 1834 by the Duke of Devonshire and remained at Chatsworth House until 1914, when it came into the possession of H. E. Huntington, Esq., of New York. Students of the drama were for the first time supplied with a reprint of this text in 1898, by Brandl (*Quellen und Forschungen* LXXX), and it is also reprinted in Farmer's *Five Anonymous Plays* (1908). Mr. Brooke observes that Farmer's "notes contain an allusion to the complete Mostyn copy." This latter quarto of the complete text was brought to Mostyn Hall in North Wales about 1690, as is conjectured. At the Mostyn sale in 1907 it passed to Quaritch, and then from him to the Elizabethan Club of Yale University. Mr. Brooke finds that this text has the added advantage of being the older, as is shown by the textual differences between the two.

Mr. Brooke has not made the reprinting of his unique quarto an easy task. He has not been content to rely solely on the printer's art, altho the beautiful new quarto (with text in black-letter) will win for him an appropriate share of appreciative thanks; but the results of his editorial acumen and scholarly industry will overtop the gratitude of the mere book-lover. His edition is strictly critical. The readings of the incomplete quarto are carefully exhibited, and explanatory and illustrative matter of considerable variety is brought together in twenty-four pages of notes. Then follow brief but important appendices on the authorship of the play, on MS. notes found in the Yale copy, and on the incomplete quarto and Brandl's reprint. With these parts is to be mentioned the Introduction, supplying the history of the quartos, a discussion of the play's ending, and an analysis of the rôle of *Common Conditions*, the Vice, "the pivot upon which the whole action of the piece turns." The student of the old plays will turn with special eagerness to the appendix on the authorship of this piece,—a subject that is involved in uncertainties of a baffling character. Mr. Brooke traverses the investigations and judgments of scholars, but arrives at no definite conclusion in the matter. At most he holds that *Common Conditions* would properly be placed at a middle point between *Cambises* and *Clyomon and Clamydes* (in this order), if a "fundamental relation between the three plays" is to be assumed. This relationship does not, however, necessarily imply common authorship; but if *Clyomon and Clamydes* be accepted as the work of the author of *Cambises*, then Thomas Preston would have "rather the best claim" to the intermediate play. In what way these plays may be interrelated awaits closer study (cf. the reserved and discriminating judgment of Mr. Brooke in his *Tudor Drama* 236 ff., where *Cambises* is declared to be "of another style"). In vocabulary, for example, there is enough to establish an affinity but more that favors a difference in authorship. The

striking mannerism in the use of the personal pronoun as a verse-tag, a stop-gap, a *cheville* is, indeed, found in the three plays, but with a difference (in *Cambises* it is very rare; only two examples are at hand; ll. 699, 928, and perhaps 389). The ungrammatical form is sparingly used in *Clyomon* ("I mean by Juliana she," i, 22: "was stoln by catiff he," iii, 89; "by serving Venus she," vi, 7; "Although that with Clamydes he," xi, 47, and only a very few more instances); it is, of course, altogether wanting in *Cambises*; whereas in *Common Conditions* it is surprisingly frequent.

J. W. B.

The new edition of the *Vita di Benvenuto Cellini*, edited by Adolfo Padovan (Milano: Hoepli, 1915), represents the excellent text of the critical edition by Orazio Bacci (Florence, 1901), very slightly and reasonably modernized, and is equipped with an introduction, notes and several illustrations. The introduction of 29 pages gives a rapid but useful survey of the events and manners of 16th century Italy: one gathers a vivid impression of the gaiety and corruption of the times, and also the impression that ideas were rare, and that Benvenuto, in his objective attitude toward life, in his total lack of reflection, is typical of his contemporaries; but nothing is said about him or his work. The notes, which are partly taken from previous editions, are scanty. Most of them contain indispensable historical information. Those which interpret obscure passages and words are not always happy: *gelosia* is explained on p. 7 as "amore" and on p. 375 as "timore," but in both places it seems to mean 'anxiety.' Some are misleading: *ogni cosa* is interpreted (p. 167) by "compiutamente," as if it were an adverbial expression, whereas it is opposed to the *nulla* before it in the same sentence. Similarly misleading are: p. 371, n. 1; and p. 324, n. 2. On p. 275 "però . . . io non corsi la detta cavalla" is interpreted in accordance with the *Crusca*: "non cavalcai." The context shows that Benvenuto did ride the mare: *non corsi* means 'I did not override.' Doubtful interpretations are: pp. 342, n. 2; 381, n. 1; 418, n. 1. Few as the notes are, some seem superfluous, as e. g., that which explains that *innanzi* (p. 149) means "prima." Opinions will differ as to whether this work needed to be expurgated for the sake of the young. The passages omitted are not many and are mostly short, but in one case over three of Bacci's finely printed royal octavo pages are missing. The omission on p. 376 leaves the story incomprehensible, and the omission of single words here and there seems all too nice. No school-boy is expected to read through this work, and the youth of the *liceo* will not be benefited by avoiding an ugly epithet on p. 376 only to meet a still uglier one which has been allowed to remain on p. 392. Benvenuto's witty reply to Bandinello, which threw the whole court into convulsions of laughter, has been sacrificed. The gaps left by the

scissors have, in every case but one, been ingeniously patched up so that no sign of them is left: a furtive procedure. Expurgation of a worthy text is always regrettable at least, and this should be said without terror of the epithet *saccentuzzo* with which Professor Scherillo threatens potential critics of the expurgated *Orlando Furioso*, another book belonging to this *Biblioteca Classica Hoepli-ana*.

J. E. S.

Altho dated 1913, the fourth part of Vol. iv of the third edition of *Goedekes Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung* (Dresden, L. Ehlermann) has only recently come to hand. The three volumes of Goethe-bibliography—designated as parts, in order to conform to the numbering of the second edition—are thus brought to conclusion. An approximate idea of the broader scope of the new edition, limited, for the present, to Vol. iv, may be gained by comparing its 1900 pages devoted to Goethe with the 340 pages of the second edition, the corresponding volume of which appeared in 1891. The greatest and most welcome increase is in the index, which takes up 210 pages of three columns, while the older edition has less than seven. One is now enabled instantly to refer even to small and comparatively unimportant articles, either by subject-matter or under the name of the writer, and every production of Goethe, down to the smallest poem, seems also to have been included. The value of the book is thus greatly enhanced, particularly to the uninitiated, who had often to scrutinize entire pages in the former edition to find the subject of his quest. Too much praise can not be accorded Dr. Kipka, the compiler of these Goethe-volumes, for his patient and painstaking work in this matter. It would be ungenerous to cite minor errors of omission or of commission, particularly as it is impossible for the editor of such a work to verify all the statements and references of his predecessors and authorities. One error, however, deserves mention, as its course of transmission can be demonstrated: The title of the small octavo edition of the *Ausgabe letzter Hand* is given as containing the words: *Unter . . . Privilegien. Taschenausgabe. Stuttgart . . . 1827/30*. Now, while scholars do refer to this edition as *Taschenausgabe*, to differentiate it from the simultaneous edition in large octavo, I have never been able to discover a single copy with this inscription, nor have I ever seen such a copy listed in any antiquarian catalog. It is simply an error introduced by Hirzel in his *Verzeichniss*, and thence copied by the older edition of Goedeke, as well as by v. Loeper in Vols. i and ii of the Weimar edition. It was also taken over by Litzmann into Vol. x, followed, however, by the qualifying clause: "Es gibt auch Exemplare dieses Formats, bei denen die Bezeichnung Taschenausgabe auf dem Titel fehlt." I venture the assertion that it is lacking in all copies.

W. K.

The new edition of Sir Sidney Lee's *Life of William Shakespeare* (The Macmillan Co., 1916) is, as stated on the title-page, "re-written and enlarged." Indeed, if we make allowance for the fuller content of the individual page, the present volume is almost twice as large as the work in its previous form. The first requirement, of course, in such a revision is that the writer should take due account of the progress of investigation relating to his subject. This requirement Sir Sidney Lee has met in a very satisfactory manner. He has incorporated into his work the essential fruits of recent researches into the history of the Elizabethan stage, the biography of the poet, and the sources of his writings, and his book has accordingly a stronger claim than ever to be regarded as the standard authority on its subject. Naturally, the expansion has been greatest in the portion of the work which deals with the Elizabethan theatres and theatrical companies. The last ten or fifteen years, as everyone knows, have witnessed an extraordinary activity in these matters. It is sufficient to cite the names of Wallace, Feuillerat, Chambers, and Murray, and in regard to the structure of the theatres and technical stage conditions Reynolds, Lawrence, and Albright. The author has availed himself fully of the publications of these and of other scholars and thereby enhanced very materially the value of this division of his work. The discussion of the poems also shows improvements. New and telling parallels to the conceits in the Sonnets are adduced, and the writer has still further strengthened his contention that these poems are without autobiographical significance. Moreover, he recognizes in them now the influence of Renaissance Platonism, to which George Wyndham and J. S. Harrison had directed attention. Other instructive features of Lee's chapter on the conceits in the Sonnets are in his discussion of Shakespeare's debt to Ovid in these poems and of the influence of classical conceptions of friendship on the relation of poet to patron in the sixteenth century. There are many other additions, both in matters of detail and in questions of larger importance, which it is impossible to recount here. Suffice it to say that, taking it as a whole, the work has been brought thoroughly up to date. In some points, of course, the author's views will not always meet with the approval of workers in this field. For instance, he is too unqualified in his derivation of the Elizabethan drama from the drama of the ancients, he speaks too dogmatically concerning the sources of the quarto texts. Few will agree with him in assigning so mature a play as *The Merchant of Venice* to 1594. There are also omissions in his discussion of the sources of *Winter's Tale*. But these *corrigenda* and others of a similar kind are minor flaws in a work of high authority.

J. D. B.

Bliss Perry, *Thomas Carlyle: How to know him* (New York, The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1915). Within small compass Professor Perry includes a graceful sketch of Carlyle's life, an account of his literary, philosophic, and social theories, and of his method of work; and a series of fairly adequate extracts from his works, illuminated by occasional criticism and comment. Within its field—that of presenting a popular yet accurate estimate of Carlyle's work—it succeeds admirably. Much had to be passed over in so brief a study; however, one omission is serious: the German background of Carlyle's work. The treatment of *Sartor* is superficial and conveys little idea of the significance of the book. Moreover one positive error, seemingly slight, is yet misleading as to the entire construction of *Sartor*. Mr. Perry says (p. 90): "The Professor's book . . . is in three parts. The first and third are devoted to various aspects of clothes-philosophy, but the second professes to be an auto-biography of Teufelsdröckh himself." But in fact *Die Kleider, ihr Werden und Wirken* is in two parts, the "historical-descriptive" and the "philosophical-speculative," dealt with respectively in books I and III of *Sartor*. Book II is founded, not on *Die Kleider*, but on the paper bags of autobiographical notes communicated to the editor by Heuschrecke. A second error is noteworthy since it post-dates by seven years the definite enunciation of the doctrine of Hero-worship. On p. 171 Mr. Perry writes: "The theory concerning the Strong Person, plainly hinted in *Chartism*, became the theme of Carlyle's next book." The inference is that the theory first appears in *Chartism* (1839). Yet it is much more than "hinted" in *Sartor*, and in the essay on *Goethe's Works* (1832) there is an important passage, purporting to come from the pen of Teufelsdröckh, on "The Greatness of Great Men," in which the theory is in essentials present.

S. C. C.

In his *French Composition* (B. H. Sanborn & Co., Boston, 1915), Mr. L. Raymond Talbot continues the effort begun in his reader, *Le Français et sa patrie*, to direct the student's attention to French manners and customs. The text-book is a well-developed series of thirty exercises taking up in order the principles of grammar, but using as material such interesting subjects as a walk in Paris, the Postal System, the Carnival, the Markets, Brittany and Normandy. Each lesson consists of twenty or more detached sentences, and two passages of connected prose, followed by the necessary notes. A vocabulary completes the book. The texts are well composed, both from the point of view of illustrating the grammatical topics indicated for study, and from that of acquainting the student with the special terms and phrases appropriate to the particular subject of the lesson. The vocabulary is fairly complete and the translations are correct, tho one might wish for a greater number of alternative terms. The book should prove useful.

M. P. B.

